GATEWAY SEMINARY-BAY AREA
3 0008 00009 9892

Baptists and Their Doctrines

B. H. CARROLL

DATE DUE

DEMCO NO. 38-298

Louis
W. Hancock

BAPTISTS
And Their Doctrines

Sermons on Distinctive Baptist Principles

BY

B. H. CARROLL, D.D.
PRESIDENT, SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Compiled by

J. B. CRANFILL, LL.D.

BROADMAN PRESS
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Copyright, 1913, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

1000—8—45—7

INTRODUCTION

COINCIDENT with the publication of a new volume by Dr. B. H. Carroll entitled "Evangelistic Sermons," I am glad to present from the press of the same publishers the present work entitled, "Baptists and Their Doctrines." Although nearly two thousand years of Christian history has been chronicled since Jesus came, it still remains true in many quarters that Baptists are much misunderstood. In remote districts it is yet alleged by those ignorant of the Baptist position that we are ignorant, prejudiced, narrow and supersectarian.

The exact reverse is true. The Baptist position is as broad as the New Testament. I thank God that it is no broader. Rather than attempt to adjust the New Testament to fit the people, it has been the aim and effort of Baptists in every age to adjust the people to fit the New Testament. In the opinion of many, the author, Dr. B. H. Carroll, has had few if any peers as an exponent of the Bible and its message. In the sermons contained in this volume, he has set forth lucidly and lovingly those distinctive principles that have characterized and identified the Baptists from the time of Christ and his Apostles until now.

It is a matter of regret that the limits of the present volume are not sufficient to enable us to

incorporate additional discussions on the great distinctive doctrines that have ever been held by the Baptists. Enough is given to acquaint the general reader with what we believe, and to equip our own people with the highest and most luminous expression of our principles that in recent years has been compiled.

I believe that a wide circulation of this book will aid the cause of truth and righteousness. It is sent upon its mission of love with earnest prayers for all who shall read its pages. This work and its companion volume, " Evangelistic Sermons," should go hand in hand. Each will fill its own place in our Christian literature, and no one can read either volume without finding much to interest and edify.

J. B. CRANFILL.

DALLAS, TEXAS.

CONTENTS

I.	Distinctive Baptist Principles . .	7
II.	Ecclesia—The Church . . .	37
III.	The Baptists One Hundred Years Ago	63
IV.	Sermons on the Resurrection—First Sermon	97
V.	Sermons on the Resurrection—Second Sermon	113
VI.	Sermons on the Resurrection—Third Sermon	128
VII.	A Sermon on the Judgment . .	145
VIII.	The Righteous Judgment of God .	158
IX.	The Christian at the Judgment .	171
X.	The Sinner at the Judgment . .	191

I

DISTINCTIVE BAPTIST PRINCIPLES

"A declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us."—Luke 1:1. "It was needful for me . . . to exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the *faith* which was once delivered to the saints."—Jude 3.

THE distinctive principles of the Baptists are those doctrines or practices which distinguish us from other Christian denominations. It is held by some that no doctrine or practice should be classed as *distinctive* which has at any time been shared, in whole or in part, by any other denomination. But this limited sense of the word distinctive is too narrow for ordinary speech or common sense. For example: The Greek church and the Baptists both practice immersion, but their doctrine of baptism is widely different from ours. Authority, subject, and design all enter as much into the validity of this ordinance as the act itself. More than mere immersion is necessary to constitute New Testament baptism. Again, the Congregationalists agree with Baptists in the form of church government, but their doctrine of the church is widely different from ours. Yet again, the statement of Chillingworth, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants," is widely different from the Baptist principle, "The New Testament, the only law of Christianity."

Moreover, this entire subject has an *historic* aspect, which may not be ignored. There has been great progress in Baptist principles since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Throughout the Protestant world there has been steady approximation by nearly all other denominations to many Baptist principles, very materially narrowing the once broad margin dividing us from other people. So that the distinctive in *history* is much more marked than the distinctive of the present day. Notable among the Baptist doctrines towards which there has been this steady approximation are "Freedom of Conscience" and "Separation of Church and State." It is one of the best established facts of history that Protestants equally with Romanists once held to the unchristian and horrible maxim: "Whose is the government—his is the religion." Geneva, Germany, Holland, Old England and New England shared it with Italy, Spain and France, as Baptists found to their cost. While, therefore, the more recent approximations towards our principles are warmly welcomed, and while the hope of still greater approximation is fondly cherished, we are not thereby estopped from entrance into the domain of history in discussing distinctive principles.

Before coming to affirmative statements, allow me to clear away the brush obstructing a fair view by disclaiming as *distinctive* the only two doctrines

which in the world's estimation constitute the sum of our distinctive princples:

(1) *Immersion is Baptism*

Immersion is not disclaimed as a Baptist doctrine, but it is disclaimed as a distinctive tenet. Think of it. For the first thirteen hundred years all Christendom held this belief. Even to-day other Christian denominations, aggregating nearly one hundred million people, believe and practice it as the only baptism. How, then, can it be our most distinguishing tenet? If, indeed, it be distinctive of our people, it is the least distinctive and the least important of all our principles. In this discussion it will not even be named as a distinctive principle.

(2) *Baptism is Essential to Salvation*

So far from being distinctive, this is not now and never has been a Baptist doctrine. More than all other people do they repudiate it. Indeed, on the contrary, the Baptists are the only people in the world who hold its exact opposite: *Salvation is essential to baptism.*

On these premises and disclaimers we may now announce in order the distinctive Baptist principles:

I. THE NEW TESTAMENT—THE LAW OF CHRISTIANITY

Doubtless many of my fellow-Christians of other denominations may be disposed to smile at the an-

nouncement of this as a distinctive Baptist principle. But let us not smile too soon. Patiently await the development of the thought. To expand the statement: All the New Testament is the Law of Christianity. The New Testament is all the Law of Christianity. The New Testament will always be all the Law of Christianity. This does not deny the inspiration or profit of the Old Testament, nor that the New is a development of the Old. It affirms, however, that the Old Testament, as a typical, educational and transitory system, was fulfilled by Christ, and as a standard of law and way of life was nailed to the cross of Christ and so taken out of the way. The principle teaches that we should not go to the Old Testament to find Christian law or Christian institutions. Not there do we find the true idea of the Christian church, or its members, or its ordinances, or its government, or its officers, or its sacrifices, or its worship, or its mission, or its ritual, or its priesthood. Now, when we consider the fact that the overwhelming majority of Christendom to-day, whether Greek, Romanist or Protestant, borrow from the Old Testament so much of their doctrine of the church, including its members, officers, ritual ordinances, government, liturgy and mission, we may well call this a distinctive Baptist principle. This is not a question of what is the Bible. If it were, Baptists would not be distinguished from many Protestants in rejecting the apochryphal additions incorporated

by Romanists in their Old Testament. Nor is it a stand with Chillingworth on the proposition, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants." If it were, Baptists would not be distinguished from many Protestants in rejecting the equal authority of tradition as held by the Romanists. But when Baptists say that the New Testament is the only law for Christian institutions they part company, if not theoretically at least practically, with most of the Protestant world, as well as from the Greeks and Romanists.

We believe that the church, with all that pertains to it, is strictly a New Testament institution. We do not deny that there was an Old Testament *ecclesia,* but do deny its identity with the New Testament *ecclesia.* We do not deny the circumcision of infants under Old Testament law, but do deny their baptism under New Testament law. We do not deny that there were elders under the Mosaic economy, nor even deny the facts of uninspired history concerning the elders of the Jewish synagogue. We simply claim that the New Testament alone must define the office and functions of the elder in the Christian church. Christ himself appointed its Apostles and its first seventy elders. We not only stand upon the New Testament alone in repelling Old Testament institutions, in repelling apocryphal additions thereto, in repelling the historic synagogue of the inter-biblical period as the model of the church, but to repel the binding authority of

post-apostolic history, whether embodied in the literature of the ante-Nicene fathers or in the decisions of councils, from the council at Nice, A.D. 325, to the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870. We allow not Clement, Polycarp, Hippolytus, Ignatius, Irenæus, Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius, Augustine, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII., Knox or Wesley either to determine what is New Testament law or to make law for us. In determining the office and functions of a bishop, we consider neither the Septuagint *episcopos,* nor the Gentile *episcopos,* nor the developed *episcopos* of the early Christian centuries.

We shut ourselves up to the New Testament teaching concerning the bishop. But recently the Christian world has been invited to unite on the historic episcopacy of the early Christian centuries. We made no response to this unscriptural invitation. Yet more recently, the eccentric, and I may add, the heretical, higher critic, Dr. Briggs, seeks, it seems, to unite the Christian world on the word *katholikos* (universal) as applied to the church and as defined in these same early Christian centuries. We utterly disregard this invitation, not only because his word *katholikos* is found nowhere in the Greek of either Old or New Testament, but because the idea of catholicity must not be learned from post-apostolic fathers, but from the inspired New Testament, and because it was this word,

katholikos, which led to the idea of the church as an organized general body having appellate jurisdiction over the particular congregations, and led to the union of church and state under Constantine. We are willing enough to enter the domain of uninspired history as a matter of research, and ready enough to concede all its fairly established facts, whatever sound proof may show them to be, but we recognize as the only ground of union, now or hereafter, the impregnable rock of the New Testament.

And mark you the first form of the expanded statement: All the New Testament is the law of Christianity. To apply this thought: One Christian denomination, in determining the law of pardon, would shut us out of the four Gospel narratives up to the resurrection of Christ and shut us up to the latter half of the New Testament. Here we say, give us all the New Testament. The cases of forgiveness of sin, at the mouth and hand of our Lord himself, must be considered in determining the law of pardon.

The New Testament is the law of Christianity. All the New Testament is the law of Christianity. The New Testament is all the law of Christianity. The New Testament always will be all the law of Christianity. Avaunt, ye types and shadows! Avaunt, Apocrypha! Avaunt, O Synagogue! Avaunt, Tradition, thou hoary-headed liar. Hush! Be still and listen! All through the Christian ages

—from dark and noisome dungeons, from the lone wanderings of banishment and expatriation, from the roarings and sickening conflagrations of martyr fires—there comes a voice—shouted here, whispered there, sighed, sobbed, or gasped elsewhere—a Baptist voice, clearer than a silver trumpet and sweeter than the chime of bells, a voice that freights and glorifies the breeze or gale that bears it. O Earth, hearken to it: *The New Testament is the law of Christianity!* Let the disciples of Zoroaster, Brahma, Confucius, Zeno and Epicurus hear it. And when Mahomet comes with his Koran, or Joe Smith with his book of Mormon, or Swedenborg with his new revelations, or spirit-rappers, wizards, witches and necromancers with their impostures, confront each in turn with the all-sufficient revelation of this book, and when science—falsely so called (properly speculative philosophy)—would hold up the book as moribund, effete or obsolete, may that Baptist voice rebuke it. Christ himself set up his kingdom. Christ himself established his church. Christ himself gave us Christian law. And the men whom he inspired furnish us the only reliable record of these institutions. They had no successors in inspiration. The record is complete. Prophecy and vision have ceased. The canon of revelation and the period of legislation are closed. Let no man dare to add to it or take from it, or dilute it, or substitute for it. It is written. It is finished.

II. INDIVIDUALITY

This New Testament law of Christianity segregates the individual from his own family, from society with all its customs and requirements, from race and nationality, from caste, however exclusive, from all governmental control or intimidations, from all the bonds of friendship, though dear as the tie between David and Jonathan or Damon and Pythias, then isolates him from every external influence, strips him of every artificial distinction arising from wealth or poverty or social status, and then shuts him up in an exclusive circle alone with God, who is no respecter of persons, and there demands of his naked and solitary personality a voluntary surrender of his will to God's will and an immediate response of obedience to all its demands. There are no sponsors, or proxies. Enforced or insincere obedience counts nothing at all. The sole responsibility of decision and action rests directly on the individual soul. Each one must give account of himself to God. This is the first principle of New Testament law—to bring each naked soul face to face with God. When that first Baptist voice broke the silence of four hundred years it startled the world with its appeal to individuality: "Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father. Behold, the axe is laid at the root of the trees, and every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into

the fire." Do thou repent. Do thou confess thy sins. Do thou be baptized. It was the first step of Christianity, and what a colossal stride! Family ties count nothing. Greek culture nothing. Roman citizenship nothing. Circumcision nothing. O soul, thou art alone before God! The multitude shall not swallow thee up. "If thou shalt be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." Family relationship intruded upon our Lord's busiest hour. "Behold, thy mother and thy brothers seek thee." Once before he had said: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" and now like a flash of lightning comes his scathing reply: "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? Whosoever doeth the will of my heavenly Father, the same is my mother, my brother, my sister."

Another time it intruded upon him to call forth his crucial statement: "If any man hate not his father and mother and brother and sister he cannot be my disciple."

In his dying hour, on the way to the cross, he heard its voice once more: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which gave thee suck," and once more he replied. "Yea, rather blessed is she that doeth the will of God." Superiority for the twelve over Paul was claimed because they had known the Lord in the flesh. But Paul rejoined: "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the

flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more."

How often in history has the question been propounded by some wishing to shun personal responsibility! May I not refer this matter to the magistrates? May I not consult the customs of my country? May I not seek the guidance of my priest and put on him the responsibility of interpreting this book? Nay, verily. Do thou interpret. It is God's letter to thy soul. Thy right of private judgment is the crown jewel of thy humanity. Sometimes even Baptists falter on this point. I have heard one of them excuse himself from an acknowledged duty of co-operation in missions, because his church was opposed to the mission work. Not even thy church can absolve thee from individual duty. Churches are time organizations and are punished in time. They do not stand before the great white throne of judgment. But thy soul shall appear before the Judge. Well did our Lord know that there could be no evangelization of the world if ancestors, families, customs, government, commerce and priests could stand between the individual soul and God. Thy relation to God is paramount. His law takes precedence of all and swallows up all. In giving emphasis to this doctrine of individuality our Baptist fathers have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the heathen, the Romanist, the Greek, and the Protestant alike.

III. FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE

This follows from individual responsibility. If one be responsible for himself, there must be no restraint or constraint of his conscience. Neither parent, nor government, nor church, may usurp the prerogative of God as Lord of the conscience. God himself does not coerce the will. His people are volunteers, not conscripts. As has been stated, the prevalent theory in the days of the Reformation was: "Whose is the government—his is the religion." Louis XIV. revoked the Edict of Nantes, signed by his grandfather, the great Henry of Navarre. Calvin burned Servetus at the stake. Luther loosed all the hounds of persecution upon the Baptists in his day. Holland, the little republic that tore her lowlands from the ocean flood, and for eighty years, by pike and dike, repelled the Spaniard with his Inquisition, did herself destroy her greatest statesman, John of Barneveldt, and banish her great historian Grotius for conscience' sake. Henry VIII., in England, and his successors, delighted to persecute for conscience' sake. John Knox, of Scotland, so tarnished his great name. The Congregationalists of New England and the Episcopalians of Virginia alike denied freedom of conscience to their fellowmen. There was not a government in the world that allowed full liberty of conscience to all men until a Baptist established the colony of Rhode Island.

At a great dining in England John Bright asked a Baptist statesman beside him: "What special contribution have your people made to the world?" "Civil and religious liberty," replied the statesman. "A great contribution," replied John Bright. Bancroft, in his history of America, declares: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first the trophy of the Baptists." On November 5, 1658, these Baptists thus instructed their agent in England: "Plead our case in such sort as we may not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences; we do judge it no less than a point of absolute cruelty." In their petition to Charles II. they thus urged: "It is much in our hearts to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, with a full liberty of religious concernments." And so when their charter came it provided: "*No person* within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be in any wise molested, punished, disquieted or called in question, for any difference in opinion in matters of religion; *every person* may at all times freely and fully enjoy his own judgment and conscience in matters of religious concernment." And the charter of their great school, now Brown University, has a clause of equal import, a thing unknown at that time in the chartered schools of the whole world.

Freedom of conscience in our day, especially in

this country, is a familiar thing. It was not so in earlier days. Pagan, Papist and Protestant ground liberty of conscience into powder under the iron heel of their despotisms.

IV. SALVATION IS ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM AND CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Here, if nowhere else, Baptists stand absolutely alone. The foot of no other denomination in Christendom rests on this plank. Blood before water—the altar before the laver. This principle eliminates not only all infant baptism and membership, but locates the adult's remission of sins in the fountain of blood instead of the fountain of water. When the author of the letter to the Hebrews declares: "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins," he bases the impossibility on the lack of intrinsic merit. Following the precise idea Baptists declare: "It is not possible that the water of baptism should take away sins." There is no intrinsic merit in the water. The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, alone can cleanse us from sin. True, the water of baptism and the wine of the Lord's Supper may symbolically take away sins, but not in fact. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Both declarations are beautiful and impressive figures of antecedent fact.

A brother of another denomination once objected: "You Baptists have no method of induction into Christ. My people baptize a man into Christ." The reply was two-fold: (1) It is not enough to get a man into Christ; you must also get Christ into him, as he says, "I in you and you in me." If you insist that baptism really, and not figuratively, puts a man into Christ, how will you meet the Romanist on the other half of it, "Eating the wafer of the Supper really puts Christ into the man. He eats the flesh of the real presence"? You must admit that the words are stronger for his induction than yours.

(2) Baptists have a method of double induction: "We have access *by faith* into this grace wherein we stand." Faith puts us into Christ. "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me." "Christ in you the hope of glory." "Ye are manifestly declared to be an epistle of Christ, . . . written with the Spirit of the living God . . . in fleshly tables of the heart." "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Thus the Holy Spirit puts Christ in us. We get into him by faith. He gets into us by the Holy Spirit, thus fulfilling his words: "I in you and you in me."

This great, vital and fundamental Baptist principle, *Salvation must precede ordinances,* does, at one blow, smite and blast those two great enemies

of religion, sacramentalism and sacerdotalism. If ritualism saves, priests are a necessity. If my salvation is conditioned on the performance of a rite, then also it is conditioned on the act and will of a third party who administers the saving rite. The doctrine of salvation by rites is the hope of the priest who alone can administer the rite. This gives both importance and revenue to his office. He multiplies the sacraments. "Two are too few. Let us have seven. The more, the better for us, and thus we will control our subjects not only from the cradle to the grave, but from conception in the womb to eternity."

Not only does our great principle destroy both sacramentalism and sacerdotalism, but it alone draws a line of cleavage between the church and the world. To perpetuate the baptism of the unsaved, whether infant or adult, tends to blot out from the earth the believer's baptism which Christ appointed. It is a question of discipleship. John the Baptist made disciples before he baptized them. Jesus made disciples before he baptized them. (John 4: 1.) John made disciples by leading them to repentance and faith. (Acts 19: 4.) Jesus made disciples by repentance and faith. (Mark 1: 15.) Jesus commanded: "Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them (the discipled)." Draw a perpendicular line. On the right of it write the words, Believers in Christ, Lovers of Christ. On the left of it write the words, Unbelievers in

Christ, Haters of Christ. Now, from which side of that line will you take your candidates for baptism? Will you baptize the hating and the unbelieving? You dare not. If from the other side you take them, then already are they God's children, for what saith the Scriptures: "Whosoever believeth has been born of God. Whosoever loveth is born of God."

Baptists do not bury the living sinner to kill him to sin. But they bury those already dead to sin. For devotion to this principle you may trace our people back by their track of blood, illumined by their fires of martyrdom.

V. THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

The church is not the expression of one idea, but of many. Only the most salient and distinctive ideas are here cited:

(1) The church is a spiritual body. None but the regenerate should belong to it. It is not a savior, but the home of the saved. I once heard a preacher say: "Join the church if you have no more religion than a horse. Join the church to get religion." When my own soul was concerned about salvation, a preacher urged me to partake of the Lord's Supper in order that I might be converted thereby.

(2) *Separation of church and state.*

The state, a secular body for secular ends, can

never be united to the church, a spiritual body for spiritual ends, without irreparable injury to both. United with the state, the church can never obey Christ: "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers. What part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Come out from among them and be ye separate." There cannot be union of church and state without persecution for conscience' sake. There cannot be a pure and converted ministry when politicians appoint the preachers. There cannot be free speech by the church against national sins when the state holds the purse. See the awful consequences of Luther's mistake on this point in Germany. There, to-day, the owner of all licensed sins, gambling houses, race tracks, saloons, houses of prostitution, must exhibit certificate of church membership. The blackest pages of American history are those which record the evils of the union of church and state in Massachusetts, Connecticut and Virginia. And in every one of them Baptists were persecuted unto blood, stripes, imprisonment and confiscation of property. Massachusetts whipped Obadiah Holmes, imprisoned Clark and banished Roger Williams. At Ashfield, in Connecticut, our Baptist fathers had the choicest parts of their farms and gardens sold under the sheriff's hammer to raise a fund for building a house of worship for another denomination and for the support of its preacher, who had virtually no congregation in that community. In Virginia,

Craig, Lunsford, Waller and others were imprisoned. The products of Baptist farms were seized to support a cock-fighting, horse-racing, hard-drinking Episcopal ministry.

In England and on the continent of Europe time would fail to tell the story of their wrongs, scourgings, cruel mockings, imprisonment and bloody death at the hands of the state church. In every age of the world they have testified for a free church in a free state. From its spiritual nature the church cannot rightfully become a political factor. Its members, indeed, as individuals and citizens merely, may align themselves at will with political parties according to each several judgment. On this very account the politician does not court the Baptist church. But any general organization called the church that becomes a mighty political factor, controlling the vote of its members through its clergy, they will court. They censure that church only with bated breath and in confidential whispers. They laud it from the housetops and often make occasion for public eulogiums.

(3) *The church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination.*

This idea of the church is fundamental and vital and yet least of all understood by the rest of the world—even the religious world. Here, therefore, I would make everything clear and plain. With Greeks, Romanists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists and many others the church is an organ-

ized denomination having appellate jurisdiction over its particular congregations. In history, the church as an organized general body, or denomination, has assumed the following forms:

(a.) Papistical or autocratic.

It starts with the idea of an earthly head. This autocrat must be the successor of some apostle, himself a primate. Inspiration must rest upon him. All Christendom must be under him. Commencing with the union of church and state under Constantine, the idea reached its final development in the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870, which declared the Pope infallible.

(b) Prelatical or episcopal.

That is, the church is a general body, governed by the bishops, bishop now having lost its New Testament meaning.

(c) Presbyterian.

That is, the church is a general body or organized denomination, governed by its presbyters, through synods and general assemblies.

In all of these the particular congregation is under the appellate jurisdiction of the higher power, the General Assembly for the Presbyterians, the General Conference for the Methodists, the Bishops for the Church of England, the Pope for the Romanists. It follows that all these general organizations must have a graded series of courts, ending with a supreme court whose decisions bind all the denomination. And of course these higher courts

provide for regular trials, with all necessary forms of law. And also, of course, the sessions of these high courts must last quite a long time in order to attend to all these trials. With all of them the church is an organized denomination having appellate and final jurisdiction over all particular congregations.

Now, in opposition to all these, the Baptists hold that the New Testament church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination. According to the New Testament: "In Christ, each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord." Each congregation is a complete temple in itself, and has final jurisdiction over all its affairs. This is the church, to which grievances must be told, and whose decision is final. (Matt. 18:15-18.) The most forceful and popular objection urged against this idea of the church is that it will be powerless to secure unity of faith, uniformity of discipline, and co-operation in general work among the churches. This objection comes from the viewpoint of human reason. And we frankly admit that whatever theory of the church fails necessarily and generally to secure these great ends discounts itself in probability as scriptural in favor of any other theory which does secure these great ends, simply because we cannot conceive of God's wisdom failing. On this account, once in the Northern States of our Union, and more recently in the Southern States,

there have been tendencies among Baptists which if they had been successful and followed to their logical consequences would have resulted in this idea of the church:

(d) A federation, like the United States. In this the representative system prevails. Each state selects its representatives, delegates powers to them, projects its sovereignty into the general body, and there merges it into a supreme government for national affairs. These mistaken brethren, North and South, started out with the contention that a Baptist general body, whether district association, state convention or national convention, *must be composed of churches alone, represented by delegates having delegated powers.* But a Baptist church cannot project or merge its sovereignty into a general body of any kind, nor delegate its powers. There is not and cannot be a Baptist federal body.

Read again Dr. Wayland's great book, "The Principles and Practices of the Baptists," and there see how the unscriptural idea perished before the wisdom of the brethren. As the good doctor says, "we now wonder that anybody ever supposed that there could be a representative Baptist general body." In like manner, in the South, all attempts to reduce our Southern Baptist Convention or state bodies to this basis have failed for similar good reasons. Our general bodies are purely voluntary, and composed of individuals, not churches. They are solely for counsel and co-operation. They can-

not have trials, seeing they possess no ecclesiastical powers. Their sessions have no time for trials, lasting only three or four days. In considering the one question of eligibility for membership in the body they must necessarily act in a summary way on account of time. Their declining to seat any man in no way affects his ecclesiastical status. To ask for regular trial before a Baptist general body, or to claim all the legal forms of procedure in regular courts, whether ecclesiastical or civil, is an absurdity on its face and betrays ignorance of fundamental Baptist principles.

It is just upon this point the world, with its graded courts, and other denominations, with their graded courts and regular forms of trial, fail to understand Baptist principles. They look upon any decision of our general bodies touching membership as similar to the decision of their courts and marvel at our lack of regular forms of trial. The average man thinks of the Methodist Conference and of the Presbyterian Assemblies or of the courts of the country, in deciding upon the merits of a decision on membership by a Baptist general body, and wonders why we do not observe the usual forms of regular courts. They fail to see that a Baptist general body, unlike a Methodist Conference or Presbyterian Assembly, is not and cannot be a court, because with Baptists the church is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination. The particular church is a court and does have its

regular forms of trial. No Baptist general body could complete one trial, according to forms of law, in ten years, considering the time at its disposal and the multitude and magnitude of legitimate work that must be considered in its short sessions.

The supreme question then arises, can we with our ideas of the church secure unity of the faith guard against hurtful schisms, bring about substantial uniformity of discipline, and, above all, secure co-operation in the great departments of work beyond the ability of a single church, namely, missions, education, religious literature and philanthropy?

It is simply stated as an historical fact, without argument here, that Baptists come nearer to uniformity of faith and discipline and have fewer hurtful schisms than the denominations which seek to secure these results by their iron general organizations. With history before us we are willing to compare results. As to the success of co-operation by our simple methods, we may here in Texas point to a demonstration. Since our session in San Antonio in 1897, which eliminated non-coöperation and obstruction, this State Convention has raised more than a million dollars in cash for education, missions, orphanage, church building and other departments of work. We can find no building that will hold our Convention when assembled. Spiritual power, mighty faith, melting prayer and marvelous unanimity characterize our assemblies.

While the world stands this demonstration will avail for justification of our theory of the church.

(4) *The church is a pure democracy.*

Indeed, it is the only one in the world. There is no disbarment of franchise on account of race, education, wealth, age or sex. In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, bond or free, man or woman or child. All its members are equal fellow-citizens, and the majority decides. It is of the people, for the people, by the people. This democracy receives and dismisses its members, chooses or deposes its own officers, and manages its own affairs.

(5) *It is the supreme court in Christ's kingdom.*

All cases of discipline come before it, and its decisions are final and irreversible by any human power apart from itself. Of course, it is under law to Christ. It possesses judicial and executive but no legislative powers. Christ is the only lawmaker and the New Testament is his law. Its judicial powers cover all cases of grievances and fellowship. It is Christ's court. Our Lord foresaw the inadequacy of secular courts to adjudicate religious differences. The very atmosphere of secular courts is adverse to the religious spirit. Our Lord himself was a victim before the courts of Pilate and Herod. He warned his people that, in every age, they would be dragged before these courts, and clearly foretold what they must expect at the bar of these tribunals.

One of the most impressive lessons of the New Testament is the recital of the trials of his ministers before them. Nearly every one of his apostles was put to a violent death by their decisions. Who has not thrilled at the story of Paul before the magistrates at Philippi, before Gallio, Felix, Festus, Agrippa and Nero? Our Lord carefully provided for the settlement of religious differences before his own court. Hear the indignant protest of his apostle against the violators of his law in this respect: "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? How much more things that pertain to this life! If then ye have judgment of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are at least esteemed in the church. I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? No, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?"

(6) The officers of the church are bishops and deacons, the first charged with spiritualities and

the second with temporalities. The idea of a metropolitan bishop, having charge of all the churches of a great city, or of a diocesan bishop, having charge of a province, or state, is of post-apostolic origin and subversive of the scriptural idea of the bishop.

(7) The ordinances of the church are but two, baptism and the Lord's Supper, neither as a means of grace, but both purely figurative and commemorative. The elements of validity in baptism are: (a) it must be by proper authority; (b) its subject is a penitent believer or saved person; (c) the act is immersion; (d) the design is a declaration or confession of faith, symbolizing the cleansing from sin and commemorative of the resurrection. The Supper is a festival observed by the church as a body, and commemorates the atoning death of our Lord and anticipates his second advent. Who may deny that this doctrine of the church is a distinctive principle of the Baptists? Allow me to sum up in one sentence the complex idea of the church: It is a spiritual body; it must be separated from the state; it is a particular congregation and not an organized denomination, whether Papistical, Episcopal, Presbyterian or federal; it is a pure democracy; it is Christ's executive and judiciary on earth; its officers are bishops and deacons; its ordinances are baptism and the Lord's Supper.

And now, brethren, allow me to put before you a mental diagram embodying the most of what has

been said and which itself as a whole is distinctive of the Baptists. We will call it

VI. GOD'S ORDER IN THE GOSPEL OF HIS SON

Conceive of a circle; in it a man on his knees is reading the New Testament. Both the open book and the man's heart are illumined by the shining of the Holy Spirit. Outside the circle are the man's family, kindred and friends, society and the government. That illumined book is the law of Christianity. The man is individuality, isolated from home, family, kindred, society and government and shut in with God the Holy Spirit. His conscience is free to decide without embarrassment or hindrance from all external forces or influences. By the Spirit, through the book, his free conscience leads him to an opening in the circle which leads him to salvation. Conviction, changing of his mind, giving of faith on the Spirit's part; the exercise of contrition, repentance and faith on the man's part. These are the constituent elements of regeneration from both divine and human sides. The man is now justified—saved—a child of God. Here is Christian fellowship.

Across the saved man's path runs a river, called baptism. Up through its waters he comes to a door in another circle. This circle is the church, Christ's executive and judiciary. In the center of this circle is the Lord's table. Here is church fellowship and communion. This church is a single congregation,

a spiritual body, a pure democracy. Here is the elder or bishop, a simple pastor chosen by the church, and the deacons, who attend to temporal matters. Here is the church conference or court to which brethren bring their grievances for final settlement. Outside in the outlying world are the secular courts. All along the windings of that river of baptism and its tributaries are other church circles, each complete in itself, each with the Lord's table, and the conference, and the bishop and the deacons. Comity prevails among these churches. There is one law, one Lord, one baptism. A brother in one church, aggrieved against a brother in another church, must carry his case to the church of the offending brother. There is no way to arraign the offending brother before the world's courts without breaking down God's barriers of law and putting religion to open shame. Out here in territory filled with churches is a convention, state or national. It is a purely co-operative and advisory body. It is composed of individuals, not churches. It is a method, without an iron organization which would swallow up the churches, to elicit, combine and direct the energies and resources of the willing-hearted in all the churches in order to push great movements of evangelization, establish Christian schools, eleemosynary institutions and devise agencies and means for filling the world with Christian literature, all these mighty enterprises lying beyond the power of a single church.

One successful demonstration that all these great things can be done by a simple and harmless agency of voluntary co-operation of individuals refutes forever the idea of the church as an organized denomination or general body. There is no necessity for it. There is tyranny in it. There is the subversion of Christ's church in it. There is hierarchy in it. My heart exults! My soul leaps for joy that this Convention has furnished proof beyond all successful contradiction that there is no necessity for a hierarchy in order to promote harmony, secure unity of faith and discipline, and to obtain co-operation broad enough and strong enough to do anything God's people ought to do. That demonstration lifts itself up like a granite mountain. Transient clouds of angry criticism hang around its outskirts and splinter their petty lightnings on its adamantine sides. Foul aspersion and misrepresentation may spatter their mud and slime around its base. In the caves of its foothills a few skulking wolves of prejudice may make their dens and render night hideous by their howlings. But the mountain itself stands immovable and serene. No mists gather about its summit, far above the range and rage of storms. By night the stars silver its crest and by day its halo of sunlight is like the smile of God. This is God's order in the gospel of his Son, and the order is itself a distinctive Baptist principle.

II

ECCLESIA—THE CHURCH

MATT. 16: 18, 19 has been for many centuries a battleground of theological controversies. Though millions of the disputants have passed away, the questions which arrayed them against each other still survive to align their successors in hostile array.

The most important of these divisive questions are:

1. What is the church?
2. Who established it, and when?
3. What the foundation?
4. What the "gates of hell"?
5. What the "keys"?
6. What the "binding and loosing"?

In replying to these questions it should constantly be borne in mind that all the intelligence, piety, sincerity and scholarship of the world are not monopolized by any one age, nor by any one denomination. Still less does infallibility of interpretation belong to any one party of conflicting views within a single denomination. And yet still less may any one man assume that wisdom on this subject will die with him. It becomes a single teacher, therefore, to be modest, and while he may

not from the nature of the case avoid dogmatism, let him at least shun *offensive* dogmatism and be duly considerate of the feelings of others.

Of one thing you may be assured, that these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered by any human *ipse dixit*. Nor is there the slightest hope of solution in appeals to human creeds and histories. These are as variant and conflicting as their composers and all are without a shred of authority.

Let it be enough for us to seek a solution satisfactory to our own minds in the study for ourselves of the Bible alone.

You will understand, therefore, that the conclusions herein set forth, though reached by careful, prayerful and honest study of the one book alone, are worth no more than their intrinsic merit may warrant, and that having already given you a list of all the New Testament uses of the word, you are left entirely free to test every conclusion for yourselves, by the given usage, and then to accept, modify or reject it, as your own judgment and conscience may direct.

In this lecture there will be time for answer to the first question only:

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

From the given list of passages, taken from the Englishman's Greek Concordance, and which you

may verify by reference to the Bible, it appears that the word *ecclesia,* usually rendered "church" in our version, occurs 117 times in the Greek New Testament (omitting Acts 2:47 as not in the best texts).

Our Lord and the New Testament writers neither coined this word nor employed it in any unusual sense. Before their time it was in common use, of well-understood signification, and subject like any other word to varied employment, according to the established laws of language. That is, it might be used abstractly, or generically, or particularly, or prospectively, without losing its essential meaning.

To simplify and shorten the work before us, we need not leave the New Testament to find examples of its classic or Septuagint use. Fair examples of both are in the list of New Testament passages given you.

What, then, etymologically, is the meaning of this word?

Its primary meaning is: An organized assembly, whose members have been properly called out from private homes or business to attend to public affairs. This definition necessarily implies prescribed conditions of membership.

This meaning, substantially, applies alike to the *ecclesia* of a self-governing Greek state (Acts 19:39), the Old Testament *ecclesia* or convocation of National Israel (Acts 7:38) and to the New Testament *ecclesia.*

When, in this lesson, our Lord says: "On this rock I will build MY *ecclesia*," while the "my" distinguished his *ecclesia* from the Greek state *ecclesia* and the Old Testament *ecclesia*, the word itself naturally retains its ordinary meaning.

Indeed, even when by accommodation it is applied to an irregular gathering (Acts 19:32, 41) the essential idea of *assembly* remains.

Of the 117 instances of use in the New Testament certainly all but five (Acts 7:38; 19:32, 39, 42; Heb. 2:12) refer to Christ's *ecclesia*. And since Hebrews 2:12, though a quotation from the Old Testament, is prophetic, finding fulfillment in New Testament times, we need not regard it as an exception. These 113 uses of the word, including Hebrews 2:12, refer either to the *particular assembly* of Jesus Christ on earth, or to his *general assembly* in glory.

Commonly, that is in nearly all the uses, it means: The particular assembly of Christ's baptized disciples on earth, as "The church of God which is at Corinth."

To this class necessarily belong all abstract or generic uses of the word, for whenever the abstract or generic finds concrete expression, or takes operative shape, it is always a particular assembly.

This follows from the laws of language governing the use of words.

For example, if an English statesman, referring to the right of each individual citizen to be tried

by his peers, should say: "On this rock England will build her jury and all the power of tyrants shall not prevail against it," he uses the term jury in an *abstract* sense, *i.e.*, in the sense of an *institution*. But when this institution finds concrete expression, or becomes operative, it is always a particular jury of twelve men, and never an aggregation of all juries into one big jury.

Or if a law writer should say: "In trials of fact, by oral testimony, the court shall be the judge of the law, and the jury shall be the judge of the facts," and if he should add: "In giving evidence, the witness shall tell what he knows to the jury, and not to the court," he evidently uses the terms "court," "jury" and "witness" in a generic sense. But in the application the *generic* always becomes *particular—i.e.*, a particular judge, a particular jury or a particular witness, and never an aggregate of all judges into one big judge, nor of all juries into one big jury, nor of all witnesses into one big witness. Hence we say that the laws of language require that all abstract and generic uses of the word *ecclesia* should be classified with the particular assembly and not with the general assembly.

As examples of the abstract use of *ecclesia*, that is in the sense of an *institution*, we cite Matt. 16: 18; Eph. 3: 10, 21.

Matt. 18: 17 is an example of generic use. That is, it designates the *kind* (genus) of tribunal to which difficulties must be referred without restric-

tion of application to any one particular church by name. I mean that while its application must always be to a particular church, yet it is not restricted to just one, as the church at Jerusalem, but is equally applicable to every other particular church.

As when Paul says: "The husband is the head of the wife," the terms "husband" and "wife" are not to be restricted in application to John Jones and his wife, but apply equally to every other specific husband and wife.

But while nearly all of the 113 instances of the use of *ecclesia* belong to the particular class, there are some instances, as Heb. 12:23 and Eph. 5:25-27, where the reference seems to be to the general assembly of Christ. But in every such case the *ecclesia* is *prospective*, not actual. That is to say, there is *not now* but there *will be* a general assembly of Christ's people. That general assembly will be composed of all the redeemed of all time.

Here are three indisputable and very significant facts concerning Christ's general assembly:

(1) Many of its members, properly called out, are now in heaven.

(2) Many others of them, also called out, are here on earth.

(3) Indefinite millions of them, probably the great majority, yet to be called, are neither on earth nor in heaven, because they are yet unborn, and therefore non-existent.

It follows that if one part of the membership is now in heaven, another part on earth, another part not yet born, *there is as yet no assembly,* except in prospect.

And if a part, probably the majority, are as yet non-existent, how can one say the general assembly *exists now?*

We may, however, properly speak of the general assembly now, because, though part of it is yet non-existent, and though there has not yet been a gathering together of the other two parts, the mind may *conceive* of that gathering as an accomplished fact.

In God's purposes and plans, the general assembly exists now, and also in our conceptions or anticipations, but certainly not as a fact. The details of God's purpose are now being worked out, and the process will continue until all the elect have been called, justified, glorified and *assembled.*

Commenting on our lesson, Dr. Broadus says:

" In the New Testament the *spiritual* Israel, never actually assembled, is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is denoted by the word *ecclesia.*" Here Dr. B. does not contrast " spiritual Israel " with a particular church of Christ, but with national or carnal Israel.

The object of the gospel, committed to the particular assembly in time, is to call out or summon those who shall compose the general assembly in eternity.

When the calling out is ended, and all the called are glorified, then the present concept of a general assembly will be a fact. Then and only then, *actually,* will all the redeemed be an *ecclesia.* Moreover, this *ecclesia in glory* will be the real body, temple, flock or bride of our Lord.

But the only *existing* representation or type of the *ecclesia in glory* (*i.e.,* the general assembly) is the particular assembly on earth.

And because each and every particular assembly is the representation, or type, of the general assembly, to each and every one of them are applied all the broad figures which pertain to the general assembly. That is, such figures as "the house of God," "the temple of the Lord," "the body," or "flock" or "bride of Christ." The New Testament applies these figures just as freely and frequently to the particular assembly as to the general assembly. That is, to any one particular assembly, by itself alone, but never to all the particular assemblies *collectively.*

There is no unity, no organization, nor gathering together and, hence, no *ecclesia* or assembly of particular congregations collectively. So also the term *ecclesia* cannot be rationally applied to all denominations collectively, nor to all living professors of religion, nor to all living believers collectively. In no sense are any such unassembled aggregates an *ecclesia.* None of them constitutes the flock, bride, temple, body or house of God, either as a

type of time or a reality of eternity. These terms belong exclusively either to the particular assembly now or the general assembly hereafter.

A man once said to me, How dare you apply such broad terms as "The house of God," "The body of Christ," "The temple of the Lord," to your little fragment of a denomination? My reply was, I do not apply them to any denomination, nor to any aggregate of the particular congregations of any or of all denominations, but the Scriptures do apply every one of them to a particular New Testament congregation of Christ's disciples.

Hear the Word of God:

In the letter to the Ephesians, Paul says: "In whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. 2:21, 22, R. V.)

Here are two distinct affirmations:

First—Each several building or particular assembly groweth into a holy temple of the Lord. That is, by itself it is a temple of the Lord.

Second—What is true of each is true of the church at Ephesus, "In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit."

Just before this he had written of the church as an *institution*, or abstractly, in which Jew and Gentile are made into one. But the abstract becomes concrete in each several building.

To the elders of this same particular church at Ephesus he said: "Take heed to yourselves, and to *all the flock,* in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, *to feed the church of the Lord* which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20: 28.)

This flock, this church of the Lord, purchased by his own blood, is a particular assembly.

Again to the particular church at Corinth Paul wrote: "Ye are God's building—ye are a *temple* of God and the Spirit dwelleth in you—now ye are the *body* of Christ, and severally members thereof." (1 Cor. 3: 7, 16; 12: 27.)

When concerning the body of Christ he says: "And whether one member suffereth all the members suffer with it," he is certainly not speaking of the *ecclesia in glory,* all of whose members will be past sufferings when constituting an *ecclesia.*

Again concerning the particular church at Ephesus, he writes to Timothy, whom he had left in that city: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know, how men ought to behave themselves in *the house of God,* which is *the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*" He is certainly not writing of behavior in the general assembly in glory. The things he had written touching behavior were, when and how the men should pray, how the women should dress and work, and the qualifications of bishops and deacons. Even that remarkable passage, so often and so confi-

dently quoted as referring exclusively to some supposed now-existing "universal, invisible, spiritual church," namely: Eph. 1:22, 23, "And gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all"—even this very body, "filled unto all the fullness of God," is presently applied, in his prayer, to the particular congregation. (Eph. 3:19.)

But it may be asked how could Paul pray that a particular congregation might be filled unto all the fullness of God? The reply is obvious. Each particular assembly is an habitation of God through the Spirit. The Spirit occupies each several building. Into each he enters not with partial power, but in all the fullness of Omnipotent power.

But though the fullness is there, the church is so dim-eyed—so weak in faith—so feeble in graces—it does not realize and lay hold of and appropriate this fullness of God. Hence the prayer that the eyes of their understanding might be open to see the fullness, their faith increased to grasp and appropriate it, their graces enlarged to corresponding strength to stand and work in that fullness. So fulfilled they realize in *experience* the fact that the Holy Spirit in all the fullness of God had already entered this particular body of Christ, and was only waiting to be recognized. It is like the expression, "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God," etc. (Rom. 5:1.) That is, we are entitled to it, let us take it.

In a great revival of religion we see Paul's prayer fulfilled in the particular body of Christ. Gradually the church warms up to a realization of the fullness of God dwelling in them through the Spirit. Their spiritual apprehension becomes eagle-eyed. The grasp of their faith becomes the grip of a giant. Presently they say, we "can do all things." No barrier is now insurmountable. And as more and more they comprehend the height and depth and width and length of the love of God, they glow like a spiritual furnace. Thus it is proven that all these broad terms appertaining to the future general assembly are equally applied to the present particular assembly, and that, too, because it is the only existing representation of the prospective general assembly.

This leads to another conclusion: All teaching in the direction that there now exists a general assembly which is invisible, without ordinances, and which is entered by faith alone, will likely tend to discredit the particular assembly, which does now really exist and which is the pillar and ground of the truth.

More than once when I have inquired of a man, are you a member of the church? the reply has been, I am a member of the invisible, universal, spiritual church.

To make faith the exclusive term of admission into the general assembly is more than questionable and naturally generates such replies.

The general assembly, by all accounts, includes all the saved. But infants, dying in infancy, are a part of the saved. Yet never having been subjects of gospel address they are saved without faith. But it may be said that such use of the term faith is only a way of saying "a new heart," and dying infants are not without regeneration. To which we may rejoin that regeneration alone is not sufficient to qualify for membership in the general assembly. All the regenerates we know have spots and wrinkles, while the Bride, the general assembly, is without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.

Nor does complete sanctification of soul go far enough. There must also be glorification of body. Enoch, Elijah and probably those who rose from the dead after Christ's resurrection are the only ones as yet qualified for membership in the general assembly. And they must wait until all whom God has called and will yet call have arrived with like qualifications, before there can be a general assembly in fact.

As has been intimated, all organized assemblies have prescribed terms or conditions of membership. In the Greek state *ecclesia* membership was limited to a well-defined body of citizens. Not all residents of the territory could participate in the business of the *ecclesia*. So with the Old Testament *ecclesia* or national convocation of carnal Israel. One must have the required lineal descent and be circumcised or become a proselyte and be circumcised. Corre-

spondingly the conditions of membership in the church on earth are regeneration and baptism.

But for the church in glory the conditions of membership are justification, regeneration and sanctification of soul and glorification of body.

We submit another conclusion:

Some terms or descriptives commonly applied to the church by writers and speakers are not only extra-scriptural, that is, purely human and post-apostolic, but may be so used as to become either misleading or positively unscriptural. For example, to put *visible,* referring to the particular assembly alone, over against *spiritual* as referring to the general assembly alone, as if these terms were opposites or incompatible with each other.

The particular assembly or church that now is, is both visible and spiritual.

To confess Christ before men, to let our light shine before men, to be baptized, to *show forth* the Lord's death in the Supper, are both visible and spiritual acts of obedience. And when the general assembly becomes a reality instead of a prospect, it, too, will be both visible and spiritual.

Speaking of the general assembly, John says: "I *saw* the holy city, the New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband."

When the King came to the earth in his humiliation he was visible. And when he *appears* in glory every eye shall see him.

A city set upon an earthly hill cannot be hid. And the New Jerusalem on Mt. Zion, the city of the living God, will be the most conspicuous and luminous object the universe ever saw.

The confusion wrought by these human appellatives is manifest in the growth of what is commonly miscalled "the Apostles' creed." In its earliest historic forms it says: "I believe in the holy church." Later forms say: "I believe in the holy catholic, *i.e.*, universal church." Still later: "in the holy catholic and apostolic church." Still gathering increment from other creeds it becomes: "The holy Roman catholic and apostolic church." Then comes "visible *vs.* invisible," or "visible, temporal, universal *vs.* invisible, spiritual, universal," and so *ad infinitum*. But the Bible in its simplicity knows nothing of these scholastic refinements of distinction. In that holy book the existing church is a particular congregation of Christ's baptized disciples, and the prospective church is the general assembly. But mark you:

These are not co-existent.

One cannot be a member of both at the same time. When the general assembly comes the particular assembly will have passed away.

To impress more deeply the scripturalness of these reflections, let us consider the subject from another viewpoint:

A house is built for an inhabitant. Unless the tenant is hard pressed, he will not move in until

the building is completed. God is never hard pressed.

A long time may be consumed in getting out and gathering together and preparing the material of a house. It is not a house, however, except in purpose, plan or prospect, until it is completed and ready for its occupant.

In this light let us take a look at some Bible houses:

(a) *The house that Moses built.*

This was the Tabernacle of the Wilderness, or tent for God. The 40th chapter of Exodus tells of the completion of this house. When it was finished and all things ready for the occupant it became a house, and then the cloud, that symbol of divine glory, moved in and filled the tabernacle.

(b) *The house that Solomon built.*

The 6th, 7th and 8th chapters of 1 Kings tell us about this house. When it was finished and furnished and dedicated, it also being now a house, then the cloud symbol of divine presence and glory, that had inhabited the tabernacle, left the tent as no longer useful and moved into and filled the new house.

(c) *The house that Jesus built.*

The gospel histories tell us about it. John the Baptist prepared much material for it. Receiving this material from John, and adding much of his own preparation, Jesus built a house. That is, he instituted his *ecclesia* on earth. At his death the

veil of Solomon's restored house was rent in twain from top to bottom. Henceforward, it was tenantless, and, being useless, soon perished. But though the new house was built, it was empty until our Lord ascended into heaven, and fulfilled his promise to send the Holy Spirit as the indweller of this new habitation. Acts 2 tells us how this house was occupied. The useless temple of Solomon now passes away as the useless tabernacle of Moses passed away for its successor. The only house of God now existing on earth is the particular *ecclesia* of our Lord. But it in turn must have a successor in the general assembly, or,

(d) *The house Jesus will build.*

The tabernacle, the temple and the church on earth are all forecasts of the coming church in glory. The work of gathering and preparing material for the general assembly has been in progress for six thousand years. But material, much of it yet in the quarry or forest and little of it fully prepared, does not constitute a house. God is not hard pressed. His patience is infinite. Millions and millions have already been called out to be members of this prospective assembly. God is calling yet and will continue to call throughout the gospel dispensation. His mind is fixed on having a general assembly indeed—a great congregation—" a great multitude that no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, to stand before the throne, and before the

Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palms in their hands."

The time of the constitution of this assembly is at the second coming of Christ and after the resurrection of the dead and the glorification of the bodies of Christians then living. The processes of constitution are clearly set forth in Matt. 25:31-34; 1 Cor. 15:51-54; 1 Thess. 4:13-17; Eph. 5:27; Rev. 21:2-9.

It has now indeed become a church—a glorious church, or church in glory—to be presented to himself as a bride without spot, wrinkle, or any such thing. When he comes he will be glorified in his saints and admired in all them that believe.

That *ecclesia,* like the one on earth, will be both visible and spiritual. "I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife," says the angel to John.

Recurring to the figure of a house, Rev. 21 and 22 exhibit it as at last completed and occupied. At last completed God himself inhabits it, for says the Scripture, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall be with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Mark that, brethren, "The former things are passed away." Former and latter things are not co-existent. The tabernacle of the wilderness

passes away for the more glorious temple of Solomon. The temple then passes away for the still more glorious church on earth. In like manner the church on earth must pass away for the infinitely glorious church in heaven. There is a Jerusalem on earth, but the heavenly Jerusalem is above. It is free, and the mother of all the saved. But, brother, the general assembly is not yet. The church on earth, the house that Jesus has already built, the house of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth—*this house has the right of way just now.* It is the only existing assembly. Honor the house that now is.

Quite naturally, if tabernacle and temple had been co-existent, one then living would have preferred the temple and discredited the tent.

Equally so if the particular assembly and general assembly are now co-existent, side by side on earth, could you seriously blame a man for resting content with membership in the greater and more honorable assembly?

But as the Scriptures represent these two assemblies, one existing now on earth, the other prospective in heaven, if a man on earth and in time, not qualified by either sanctification of spirit or glorification of body for the heavenly assembly, shall despise membership in the particular assembly because claiming membership in the general assembly, is not his claim both an absurdity and a pretext? Does he not hide behind it to evade honoring

God's existing institution, and the assuming of present responsibilities and the performing of present duties? Yet again, if one believes that there are co-existent on earth and in time, two churches, one only visible and formal, the other real, invisible and spiritual, is there not danger that such belief may tend to the conviction that the form, government, polity and ordinances of the inferior church are matters of little moment? Has not this belief oftentimes in history done this very thing? And is it not an historical fact that, since Protestant Pedobaptists invented this idea of a now-existing, invisible, universal, spiritual church, to offset the equally erroneous Romanist idea of a present visible, universal church, reverence and honor for God's New Testament particular church have been ground to fine powder between them as between the upper and nether millstones? To-day when one seeks to obtain due honor for the particular assembly, its ordinances, its duties, is he not in many cases thwarted in measure, or altogether in some cases, by objections arising from one or the other of these erroneous views?

And when some, endeavoring to hedge against the manifest errors of both these ideas, have invented middle theories to the effect that the church on earth is composed either of all *professing* Christians living at one time, considered collectively, or of all *real* Christians so living and so considered, or of all existing denominations considered as

branches of which the church is the tree, have they not multiplied both the absurdities and the difficulties by their assumed liberality of compromise?

Finally, replying to some of your questions:

1. When our Lord says, On this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, does he refer to the church on earth or to the church in glory? My answer is, to the particular assembly on earth, considered as an *institution*. The church in glory will never be in the slightest danger of the gates of hell. Before it becomes an assembly, both death and hell, gates and all, are cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20:14 and 21:4.) It is the church on earth that is in danger, from the fear of which this glorious promise is a guaranty.

2. Does your idea of "a general assembly" depend exclusively upon that phrase of doubtful application in Hebrews 12:23, which many good scholars, including prominent Baptists, construe with "myriads of angels" instead of with "the church of the First Born"? Certainly not. Though I myself strongly hold with our English versions in referring both the *panegyros* (general assembly) and the *ecclesia* (church) of that passage to saved men and not to angels. The idea of general assembly is clearly in other passages as Eph. 5:25-27; Rev. 7:9 and 21:24.

3. If the figures, "body" and "bride," apply to each particular church, does not that teach that

Christ has many bodies, many brides? My answer is, first, that your objection, or supposed difficulty, lies not against my view, but against the express teaching of many scriptures. What the Scriptures teach is true, and difficulties and objections may take care of themselves. But, second, the objection is specious and the difficulty only apparent, since each particular assembly is *a representation or type* of the general assembly, and therefore the broadest figures of the antitype may be applied to all its types without being obnoxious to the criticism. There may well be many representations of the body or bride of Christ.

4. Do you dis-fellowship your Baptist brethren who teach the present existence of "an universal, invisible, spiritual church"?

Most certainly not so long as they duly honor the particular assembly and its ordinances, as multitudes of them do, in spite of the natural tendency of their theory to discredit it. Many of them, known to me personally, are devoted to the particular church and its ordinances, responsibilities and duties. I delight to honor, fellowship and love these men. We agree that all the redeemed will constitute the general assembly, and that *then* it will be the real body, bride, temple, flock and house of God. We differ as to the co-existence of the two assemblies. They say both now. I say the particular now and the general hereafter.

It will take a wider divergence than this to make

me dis-fellowship a Baptist brother, though I honestly and strongly hold that even on this point his theory is erroneous and tends practically to great harm. Yes, I do most emphatically hold that this theory is responsible for incalculable dishonor put upon the church of God on earth. I repeat that the theory of the co-existence, side by side, on earth of two churches of Christ, one formal and visible, the other real, invisible and spiritual, with different terms of membership, is exceedingly mischievous and is so confusing that every believer of it becomes muddled in running the lines of separation. Do let it sink deep in your minds that the tabernacle of Moses had the exclusive right of way in its allotted time and the temple of Solomon had the exclusive right of way in its allotted time—so the church of Christ on earth, the particular assembly, now has the exclusive right of way, and is without a rival on earth or in heaven—and so the general assembly in glory, when its allotted time arrives, will have exclusive right of way.

Had I lived in the days of Moses I would have given undivided honor to the tabernacle—in the days of Solomon to the Temple alone—and when the general assembly comes, that shall be my delight. But living now I must honor the house that Jesus built. It is the house of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. To it are committed the oracles and promises of God. To it is given the great commission. It is the instructor of angels

and in it throughout all the ages of time is the glory of God. If I move out of this house, I must remain houseless until Jesus comes. It is the only church you can join in time.

5. What is the distinction, if any, between the kingdom and the church?

My answer is that the kingdom and church on earth are not co-terminous. Kingdom, besides expressing a different idea, is much broader in signification than a particular assembly or than all the particular assemblies. The particular church is that executive institution or business body, within the kingdom, charged with official duties and responsibilities for the spread of the kingdom.

In eternity and glory church and kingdom may be co-terminous. Like the church, the kingdom in both time and eternity has both visible and spiritual aspects.

6. As a sufficient reply to several other questions:

Let it be noted that this discussion designedly avoids applying certain adjectives to the noun "church," not merely because the New Testament never applies them to *ecclesia,* but because they are without distinguishing force when contrasting the particular assembly with the general assembly.

For example: "Local," "visible," "spiritual."

Locality inheres in *ecclesia.* There can be no assembly now or hereafter without a *place to meet.* When existing in fact, both the particular assem-

bly in time, and the general assembly in eternity, are both visible and spiritual. Why attempt to distinguish by terms which do not distinguish?

Katholikos (Catholic or Universal) is not a New Testament word at all and hence is never applied by inspiration to *ecclesia*. Nor is it a Septuagint word at all.

In post-apostolic times it crept without authority into the titles of certain New Testament letters, as "The First Epistle General (*Katholikos*) of Peter." And even there it could not mean "universal," since Peter, himself, four times limits his address:

(a) First to *Jews* (not Gentiles).

(b) Then to "elect" Jews (not all Jews).

(c) Then to elect Jews of the *Dispersion* (not to Jewish Christians in Palestine).

(d) Then to elect Jews of the Dispersion in "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia," *i.e.*, the comparatively small district of Asia Minor (not in the rest of Asia, Europe and Africa). Neither in the sense of every place, nor of every person in the universe, can the English word "universal" be applied to *ecclesia*.

7. Certain other questions must be deferred to a subsequent lecture, namely:

(a) Did our Lord purpose and provide for the perpetuity of the church on earth as an *institution* until his second advent?

(b) Can this perpetuity be traced historically?

Also, in subsequent lectures will be considered the other questions of our lesson, namely: Who established the church and when, What its foundation, What the gates of hell, Signification of the keys, and of binding and loosing.

III

THE BAPTISTS ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

IN treating a historic subject the writer is confronted by two impossible things: First, it is impossible to draw a truly realistic picture of times prior to one's own experience, observations and recollections. Strong indeed must be the historic imagination that can put one in his grandfather's place and cause him to see with his grandfather's eyes.

Again, it is impossible to find distinct lines of cleavage at any century milestone. Concerning any great thought or movement of time, who can put his finger on date and place and confidently say, This is when and where it started? Past, present and coming events are mingled and related like the waves of the sea. Centuries are not divided from each other by mountain ranges, oceans, rivers or chasms. History, like nature, has no leaps. If we go back one hundred years, we must go beyond, or find ourselves reading the middle volume of a serial.

Besides these two things, impossible to all men, there is another to me exceedingly difficult—to look back at all. There is in me little of the Chinaman, who delights to turn his back to the present and

worship ancestors. Habitual dwelling among reminiscences indicates death at the top. Doubtless, occasionally,

"'Tis greatly wise to talk with our past hours
And ask them what report they bore to Heaven."

Yet would I rather invoke Hope than stir up Memory, and face the future rather than the past. But as I am to tell somewhat of the Baptists one hundred years ago, reluctantly and only temporarily, I face to the rear, and turn back the shadow on the dial-plate of time one hundred years; turn it back until we are boys again; back until we become our own fathers; yet back until we become our grandfathers. The process reverses Rip Van Winkle's dream and loses us with strange identity in a strange world, experiencing the sensations of Mark Twain's "Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court."

The time is January 1, 1800. The place is Philadelphia, both capital and metropolis of the United States, and nearly as large as Dallas, Texas. The alien and sedition laws are in force. John Adams is President, with fast fading power, prestige and popularity, and this very year he will be overwhelmingly beaten by Thomas Jefferson, who will be inaugurated next March at the new capital on the Potomac. George Washington has been dead about two weeks. Philadelphia itself is in mourning on account of a malignant fever, prevalent there for

some years. The old Philadelphia Association, which for nearly a century has rarely convened out of this city, has been kept out now for three years in succession by this awful plague. Since 1797, they have been praying, fasting and resolving concerning this dreadful visitation, and for at least seven years to come, each annual minute will record that Philadelphia has been selected as the place of the next meeting, provided there be no recurrence of the malignant and contagious fever.

The year 1800! The crucial period of national trial is safely passed. By the ratification of the Federal Constitution, the United States has become a nation. Washington was inaugurated at New York eleven years ago as President of eleven United States. During the year North Carolina ratified the Constitution and entered the Union. Ten years ago, Rhode Island, the last of the original thirteen states, came in. Nine years ago Vermont was received as the first new state; eight years ago Kentucky followed; four years ago Tennessee made the third. Sixteen states in 1800.

The first census—1790—shows a population of something over 4,000,000. This decade will advance it a million. One hundred years ago. How must one shrink to fit the environment! Westward the national boundaries extend to the Mississippi River; southward to the mouth of the Yazoo River, near Vicksburg, but nowhere touching the Gulf of Mexico. Spanish Florida, joining hands with Span-

ish Louisiana, blocks the way southward and westward. This very year Louisiana—a veritable empire of territory—will be retroceded to France, and three years hence Jefferson will buy it from Bonaparte, whose fear of Admiral Nelson surrenders colonial empire, for the paltry sum of $15,000,000. This purchase, beyond reasonable doubt, includes Texas, which, on account of New England's jealousy, will not be claimed, and whose admission forty-five years later, when re-purchased by the blood of revolution, will be resisted by the same section and for the same cause.

The great northwest territory, ceded by Virginia and conquered by George Rogers Clark, has been opened to settlement for three years. Only four years ago, in tardy compliance with the treaty of 1783, the English garrisons were withdrawn from the forts which dominated it. Five years hence a son of the same Clark, with Meriwether Lewis, sent out by the same Jefferson, will add to the national domain by exploration the vast territory now covered by Oregon, Washington and Idaho. The French Revolution, which painted red the skies of the world, has given place to the Directory, which is Napoleon Bonaparte. An indiscreet envoy from that republic, impatient at Washington's wise forbearance to embarrass our new nation with entangling alliances, has recently appealed from the President to the people, and by private canvass and agitation stirs up a commotion, whose rebuke led

up to the threshold of war with France and unsealed the triumphant thunders of Truxton's guns. Strange recurrence of history—other envoys from another involved republic have just arrived upon our shores to repeat the hazardous experiment of "Citizen Genet."

One hundred years ago! It is just eight years since Eli Whitney, at Savannah, invented the cotton gin which will revolutionize the industrial world. And though there are some people both North and South, projecting with the application of steam to navigation and commerce, it is yet seven years to Fulton's steamboat, and thirty years to the first railroad and forty-four years to the first telegraphic message. The reaper, the power loom, and a thousand other mighty inventions are in the unknown future. Each community is isolated from every other by land travel. Philadelphia hears on New Year's Day how New York celebrated Christmas, and one adventurous man has traveled overland from Atlantic tidewater to Oregon in only eight months. Fenimore Cooper and Washington Irving are boys of seventeen, and William Cullen Bryant is a lad of seven.

But what about the Baptists of that day? It is impossible, in the limits of time assigned me, to more than glance at salient points, barely touching the mountain tops of loftiest events and speaking mainly of our own Southern section of the United States.

ENGLAND

In England there are four hundred Baptist churches and Bristol College. John Gill, the Hebraist, the commentator, the theologian, died twenty-nine years ago. John Milton, author of earth's greatest epic, has been dead twenty-six years. John Bunyan, author of earth's greatest allegory, died fourteen years ago. Only seven years ago William Carey, later himself a missionary in foreign lands, preached his great sermon on "Expect Great Things, Attempt Great Things." From the top of that sermon, if you were to sight backwards on a dead level, no other sermon will be high enough to cross the line of vision until you strike Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost. Tongues of supernatural fire that elder day enabled the apostles to speak to representatives of every nation under heaven in the tongue wherein they were born. But William Carey, by translation, gave the Word of God in twenty-three languages and many dialects to one-third of the world's population.

Very deliberately do I say it, the World's Ecumenical Conference on Foreign Missions, recently held in New York City, was but the outgrowth and the echo of William Carey's sermon one hundred and seven years ago. The *Edinburgh Review* denounced his mission as madness, and sneered at the missionary as "a cobbler," but the *Quarterly* more wisely will rejoin: "Only fourteen years have

elapsed since Thomas and Carey set foot in India, and in that time these missionaries have acquired the gift of tongues. In fourteen years these 'low-born and low-bred mechanics' have done more toward spreading the knowledge of the Scriptures among the heathen than has been accomplished or even attempted by all the world besides."

Thirty-four years hence the death of this "cobbler" will mark the exit of the greatest missionary factor since Paul, the tent-maker, died. Without Carey, Judson had not been. And, just here in passing, allow me to correct the prevalent misrepresentation that American Baptists first came to love Foreign Missions when Providence thrust upon them the support of Judson and Rice. I have with me the historical records to show how American Baptists received appeals from Carey's field, passed resolutions of sympathy and co-operation, and raised and forwarded funds long before Judson became a Baptist. While Carey is down in dark heathen mines, we see his greatest coadjutor, Andrew Fuller, holding the ropes in England—that Andrew Fuller, the greatest foe to Antinomianism in the century, and whose sermons and other publications are Baptist classics to-day.

And there, too, in England one hundred years ago, Robert Hall is preaching in English of eclectic elegance and power, which possesses the excellencies of Shakespeare, Johnson, Addison, Burke and Sheridan without their faults. The Philadelphia Con-

fession of Faith, adopted in 1742, and printed by Benjamin Franklin in 1743, is, with some modifications, but a reproduction of the old London Confession, adopted in 1689. It is the prevalent standard in 1800.

In Wales there are ten thousand Baptists in 1800, with Christmas Evans leading. Only four years ago he preached his famous sermon on the Healing of the Demoniac. It may interest and profit our young preachers here to-day to take a glimpse at the man and the sermon—particularly that class of modern preachers who read polite essays of fifteen minutes' length, written on tinted paper and ornamented with a pink ribbon. Over in my country if some idle wind with nothing else to do and no other chaff to blow along, should flutter the harmless thing all the way from Texarkana to Laredo, and all the Baptists in the state were out hunting a sermon, not one of them would take a shot at that. But to speak of a real sermon from a live man: Consider that it is a hot day over in Wales, and that two long-winded and very dry preachers have just preceded him (for our Baptist people of that day had almost infinite capacity for hearing sermons), then rises up a man who is to hold them spellbound three hours longer.

Just look at him. His contemporaries sketch an outline of him. The tallest, stoutest, greatest man one ever saw. He appears like one composed, on the day after a great battle, out of the scattered

members of the slain. Or like a book, taken in numbers, with some wanting. An Anak whose head is covered with thick, coarse black hair. His gait unwieldy, his limbs unequal. He has but one eye —if it might be called an eye—more properly a brilliant star, shining like Venus, bright enough to light an army through a forest. But, O my soul, how he can preach! The throng that hear him go wild. They fall to the ground as if rocked by an earthquake. They see that naked demoniac bounding out of the tombs; witness the bursting of his chains and the paroxysms of his fury, and cry out in terror at his approach. They see Jesus coming in the quiet of his majesty and casting out the demon by a word. They see the demon-driven swine hurl themselves into the deep. They witness the home-coming of that once awful father and husband. They hear the glad wife's sobs of welcome and see the astounded and yet trembling children creep from under the bed into a father's arms, while high as heaven over every other name is the name of Jesus.

That audience saw Christmas Evans as the perfect ideal of Welsh character. To them he embodied, in his rugged, honest and fervent zeal, his clear penetration and poetic fire, all the spirit and pathos of the Welsh mind. Gentlemen! Gentlemen! I would rather be able to preach to lost souls like Christmas Evans than to be the author of every speculative vagary since Epicurus died, and all the

flimsy higher criticism that ever evidenced a palsied grasp of faith. But how will such a man die? Hear him as the chariot of fire, and the convoy of angels come for him thirty-eight years hence: "I am leaving you; I have labored in the sanctuary fifty-three years, and this is my comfort, that I HAVE NEVER LABORED WITHOUT BLOOD IN THE BASIN." With his last breath he quotes an old Welsh hymn, waves a farewell and cries out to the angelic charioteer: "Wheel about, coachman, drive on!" Ah me! the groundlings of the present day, who leave out the blood—a million of them would not make a shoestring for Christmas Evans! This man preached before Baptist associations one hundred and sixty-three times. Blessed associations!

We have time only for one other Continental reference. Look yonder in the north of Ireland in the Protestant province of Ulster, famous for its siege of Londonderry—that Scotch-Irish settlement from which, impelled by tyranny, there poured out a tide of emigration thirty thousand strong, to occupy all the Blue Ridge country—an immigration that will furnish the victors of King's Mountain and give to Kentucky her Breckenridges, to Tennessee her Andrew Jackson, to Texas her Sam Houston and to Virginia her Stonewall Jackson. And to all our states many illustrious names. There in Ulster in 1800, I ask you to look, just now, at

one man only. It is Alexander Carson. He is but twenty-six years old, and soon will impress the polemical world with his unanswerable logic concerning the act of baptism, and console a million perplexed hearts with his history of Providence.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Turn to the New World. In the United States we have as data, contemporaneous with the first census in 1790, Asplund's Register, which shows in statistics, state by state, that there were in this country 564 Baptist preachers, 748 churches and 60,970 members. But that was ten years ago. A circular letter to be read next year—1801—before the Philadelphia Baptist Association, will say: "We have entered upon a new century; and while it is yet the morning of it, let us take a view of some of the works of God in the last. Ninety-four years have rolled on since the first meeting of this Association, the first in America, and then composed of only five churches; but viewing the present state of our connection in this country, we perceive it to be as the thousands of Israel, embracing numerous associations, composed of at least 1,200 churches, including more than 100,000 members."

You see, by the way, that these early Baptists knew when a century commences. The writer does not give the original sources of information from which he obtained his figures. But he seems to

speak advisedly and with confidence. Fortunately we have the full text of the centennial sermon, commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of the Association, which was preached in 1807. The preacher is Samuel Jones, a noted man in his day. He preaches from William Carey's great text to show that the great things expected and attempted fourteen years ago have been marvelously fulfilled. Without accurate statistics before him from other associations, the preacher concludes that there are 122,500 Baptists in the United States in 1807. He reckons 194 churches in Massachusetts and 150 in New York. He observes with pleasure that religious persecution of his brethren had ceased in Virginia and had abated in Massachusetts. He calls special attention to the missionary spirit, prevalent for years in many places, tending to carry the gospel to the heathen world, and expects the millennium to come by the opening of the twentieth century. We can testify that it has not yet arrived.

To put the condition before you in a realizing way, we may safely say: One hundred years ago there were in the United States about half as many Baptists as there are white Baptists in Texas to-day, and that there are in Texas to-day more Baptist preachers, churches, members and schools than there were in the whole world a century ago. Unquestionably the great and historic association in the United States one hundred years ago was the Phil-

adelphia Association. It is the Mother Eve of American Associations. From the beginning it has been sound in the faith and missionary in spirit. We hear much in that olden time of Virginia and the Carolinas sending help in many ways to New England, but Philadelphia sent help southward and her gospel came with healing in its wings. There was in 1800 no state or national organization of our people, but there were general committees, and widespread co-operation for missions, education and particularly for mutual protection against civil and religious persecution. There were no Sunday-schools of the modern kind, but there was much private and catechetical instruction. All the principles underlying the wider forms of present co-operation were then in full force. The time-limits of my address restrict discussion to the territory now covered by the Southern Baptist Convention. Let us commence with

OLD VIRGINIA

My heart always thrills at the name. The history of two states of this Union furnishes higher themes for epic poems than the less heroic affairs which inspired the songs of Homer and Virgil. One of the two is Virginia—modesty forbids that I name the other. From the beginning of its entrancing history until this good hour, life in the Old Dominion was set to heroic measure. Higher

criticism has utterly failed to destroy the historic verity of the romantic story of John Smith and Pocahontas. You know Virginia once extended on the Atlantic Coast from Cape Cod to Florida and straight westward to the Pacific Ocean, supposed to lie somewhere back of the Blue Ridge.

There is yet preserved the quaint record of an old-time writer, who states his case in a charming way. He calls attention to the intrusion of some Swedes upon Virginia soil, who were making their way up a river called Delaware, and of certain nosing Dutch who were also trespassing on a river called the Hudson. He wonders at two things: First, how far it may be from the falls of the James River, afterwards the site of Richmond, to the Pacific Ocean, Virginia's other boundary, where Drake had been sailing. And second, that the twenty thousand Puritans of New England did not leave their cold and barren shores and come down to God's country, where wild turkeys weigh sixty pounds, where raccoons are as good meat as lambs, 'possums as good as hams and artichokes as sweet as yams and where are such worlds of good tobacco and where the rivers teem with bass and shad.

You see there was some imagination there even then. The religious denominations were famous in old Virginia. The Episcopal was the state church, which for support made awful inroads on Baptist tobacco. Their own Bishop Meade tells us some marvelous stories of the gambling, swearing, horse-

racing, cock-fighting and drunken clergy, who assumed to monopolize gospel functions. One of them was a noted pugilist, who, getting into some trouble with his vestrymen, floored them all in a knock-down and drag-out fight. The following Sunday he commemorated his victory in a sermon from this text of Nehemiah: "And I contended with them and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair."

The Baptists, who were as plentiful as blackberries, themselves sometimes experimented. In the year before the American Revolution, they gravely restored apostolic succession by electing three apostles, with marvelous powers and responsibilities. One year of it was enough. It made them so sick they have been swinging back too far perhaps into the opposite extreme ever since. At least I am informed that many good brethren in those parts do not now believe in any kind of a succession or perpetuity, though holding fast yet, as I am proud to say, to the final perseverance of the saints. Time fails me to tell the wondrous story of Baptist progress in Virginia—of their great revivals, their preachers and their sufferings. A notable and far-reaching event in their history was the happy union of the Separate and Regular Baptists under the title of the United Baptist Churches of Christ in Virginia. Writing in 1809, Robert Semple, the historian of Virginia Baptists, gives a graphic account of this union which occurred twenty-two years be-

fore. Throughout the Southern States the same union was accomplished, culminating in Kentucky one year ago. I have myself seen old church letters of the three varieties—Separate, Regular and United, and counted all of them valid.

After the Revolutionary War, there were wonderful revivals among the Virginia Baptists. In 1790-2, there were 200 churches and 20,000 members, to become as the new century opens nearly 400 churches with 35,000 members, and that, too, after peopling Kentucky by migration. Oftentimes a whole church, a pastor and people, would move together to a new field without a break in organization or regular service. As in the beginning "the groves were God's first temples," so the campfires of these moving Virginians lighted up the primeval forests as they worshiped God. In the first church to which I ever preached was a colony of Virginia Baptists, all members of one of the churches ministered to by that venerable Andrew Broaddus, Jr., of Carolina, who recently passed away. Often have I read the manuscript copy of his farewell sermon to these pilgrims, one of whom, his kinsman, another Andrew Broaddus, became a distinguished Texas lawyer, and for years the president of our State Baptist Convention.

A century ago there were twice as many Baptists in Virginia as in New York, and more than in all New England. Only last year their general committee gave way to their general conference, which

in turn will become their general association. Their annual meetings were famous for spiritual power, and never failed to leave a lasting and favorable impress behind. A Methodist preacher once told me that the Baptists captured Virginia by the power of their annual meetings, particularly of the old Dover Association and their General Association. Perhaps the three greatest leaders in Virginia one hundred years ago were John Leland, Andrew Broaddus, Sr., and Robert Semple. John Leland was a mighty man of affairs, and played no small part in the revolutionary movements of his day. And while I am proud of the association of his name with that of James Madison, I delight most to think of him in one of his happy pulpit efforts.

It was a time of strong doctrine, and many Baptists were hyper-Calvinists in their view. But Leland himself tells us how, one day while preaching, "his soul got into the gospel trade-winds," which so filled his spiritual sails that he forgot about election and reprobation and so preached Christ to sinners that many accepted him as their Saviour and Lord. And oh, I would to God that the preachers of this generation, like old John Leland of long ago, would now get into the gospel trade-winds and bear away with flaming canvas the everlasting gospel to earth's remotest bounds!

Andrew Broaddus was every way a remarkable man. Think of it, ye aspiring young preachers, who long for fat city pastorates, how this man

kept refusing calls to New York, Boston, Philadelphia and other mighty centers, that he might abide with his dear old country churches. Semple became the historian of that historic time, and you would do good to yourself by adding to your library his valuable record, so recently and commendably reproduced by the *Religious Herald* men.

NORTH CAROLINA

In North Carolina, 1792, there were 94 churches with 7,500 members, to become, in 1812, 204 churches, with 12,500 members. Here were two associations, one of them unhappily to become anti-missionary in spirit, the other to send out later by way of compensation, William T. Brantly and Basil Manly, the name of each to be perpetuated in a mighty son.

SOUTH CAROLINA

In South Carolina, 1792, there were 70 churches with 4,000 members, to become, in 1812, 150 churches with 11,000 members. The very name of this state and date spontaneously call up the image of the most colossal Baptist of his day on the American continent, Richard Furman, whose name is perpetuated in a great university. My soul thrills as I watch the movements of this prince in Israel during that stormy period. I see Cornwallis posting rewards for his apprehension, so formidable is this patriot to British aggression. To the front

always was he in every enterprise in peace or war, everywhere the advocate of civil and religious liberty. Blessed with large wealth, a superb gentleman, an irreproachable character challenging the respect even of his enemies, a leader and organizer of men, Richard Furman's name must ever remain on fame's historic roll of the immortals.

GEORGIA

In Georgia, 1792, there were 50 churches, 72 preachers and 3,000 members, to become, in 1813, 5 associations, 164 churches and 15,000 members. The mighty men of this state are Henry Holcombe and Jesse Mercer. Holcombe will this very year, 1800, organize the first Baptist church in Savannah. and two years hence commence his publication of the *Analytical Repository*. Jesse Mercer, a younger man, even now outstripping his great father, Silas Mercer, will leave an impress on his own and succeeding generations time can never efface. How venerable in appearance! How equable in mind! The man who never had a personal quarrel. How pure in heart, how clean in life, how clear and sound and cogent in doctrine! His generosity and liberality illumine his life, and his character preaches louder than his tongue.

It must have been a thrilling time when this young man in 1791 accompanied his father all the way from Georgia to a meeting of the General

Committee of Virginia at Nuckol's meeting-house, Goochland County, and there heard in succession his father preach Calvinism and their fellow-Georgian, Jeremiah Walker, preach Arminianism. One of the most effective sermons ever preached on foreign missions was by Jesse Mercer from Acts 13:47. Every drop of blood in his veins was missionary blood. His gift of $2,500 at one time sent the first missionaries to Texas. Let all Texas forever hold him in loving remembrance. Soon another gift will found Mercer University.

Kentucky in 1792 had 42 churches and 3,000 members, to become, in 1812, 285 churches with 22,000 members. Among the early Kentucky Baptists were the brother and children of Daniel Boone. Unfortunately in much of Kentucky, and indeed the Southwest, there prevailed an inveterate prejudice against educated and salaried ministers.

Tennessee in 1792 had 21 churches with 900 members, to become, in 1812, 156 churches with 11,323 members. The Baptist growth in Maryland has been always slow. Armitage reports for 1793 only 17 churches, 13 preachers and 920 members. It will yet be eight years before a Baptist church will be organized in the Indian wilds of Alabama Territory not to become, until 1821, 70 churches with 2,500 members.

In the territory now comprising Mississippi, a part of which was ceded to the United States in 1797, and another part in 1819, a church was con-

stituted as early as 1780, and eight years afterward another church. By 1806, the Mississippi Baptist Association is organized with six churches. In 1812 there will be 17 churches with 764 members. The early Baptists of this territory suffered much from persecution in the days of Spanish power. They were arrested, imprisoned and threatened with deportation to the mines of Mexico, until they demanded immunity from persecution by force of arms. The Baptists were the first to convey the gospel beyond the Mississippi River. About eight Baptists, including one preacher, and the members of the Boone family from Kentucky, were in the territory now comprised by Missouri as early as 1800. There was one baptism. By 1812 there will be seven churches with 192 members. This is but a scant and unsatisfactory glance at the status of Baptist churches in the world one hundred years ago.

Any careful retrospect over the field of modern Baptist history reveals at a glance certain mighty facts or movements, uplifting themselves into clear visibility far above the dead level of ordinary events as mountain peaks tower above the plains. These are the milestones and sign-boards along the highway of human progress. Look back yonder while I point them out, peak by peak, and discern the mountain springs from which flow the streams whose mingled currents make up the river of present denominational power:

1. First of all, the giving of the Bible to the common people of the English-speaking world. The Bible, in the mother tongue, without note of expert or comment of scholar, without a priestly shadow to darken one luminous page—the naked Bible, the Father's message to men, naturally makes Baptists. One of the most thrilling and instructive classics in our language is Harwood Pattison's "History of the English Bible." A few days ago, while dining in Judson Memorial Hall, with a son of Adoniram Judson, I found myself commending this book to a bright young man, who proved to be Pattison's own son. He promised to read the book.

2. Next comes, as the natural sequence of a free Bible, that mighty struggle between the Parliament and Charles I., which culminated in the Commonwealth. To ignore that period seals up history. Ignorance of it makes it impossible to understand the Baptists of to-day. It was a colossal strife for civil and religious liberty. Victories were won in that day whose laurels will never fade and whose influence will never die. And whenever that fight has raged in the last nineteen centuries, you may count that Baptists were in it, as confidently as you look for an Irishman at a wake.

Wherever Cromwell's armies march, the Baptists, who constituted a large, heroic and influential part of them, deposited the imperishable seeds of their principles. In his Irish garrisons, 1755, were twelve Baptist governors of cities, ten colonels, three

lieutenant colonels, ten majors and forty-three company officers. Hence Richard Baxter's growl: "In Ireland the Ana-Baptists were grown so high that many of the soldiers were rebaptized as a way to preferment." In Scotland they stood unabashed under the frowns of John Knox, resisting even Cromwell's later ambitions, reminding him of their timely help at Dunbar, and still later petition the famous General Monk, the king-restorer, for high civil and religious rights. The times ripened their literary genius until it kindled flames whose light illumined the skies of the world, whose aspiring sparks hailed the stars. "The blind old bard of Scio's rocky isle" was outsoared in epic fame by a blind Baptist bard, iron Cromwell's Latin secretary. A pilgrim crept through the bars of Bedford jail and went forth into more byways and highways of earth, knocking at more doors and speaking to more peoples in their mother tongues than ever before or since a literary pilgrim has done. The tinker is dead. His statue stands where four roads meet, "a very grave person, the world behind him." It yet

". . . has eyes uplifted to heaven;
The best of books is his hand;
The law of truth still written
Upon his lips . . .
It stands as if pleading
With men."

The tinker is dead. The statue stands. The pilgrim moves on, outlasting the Wandering Jew. Indeed, the tall, wide-spreading Baptist tree of to-day is deep rooted in Cromwell's time.

3. Next in order of time and natural sequence comes the Act of Toleration, 1689, during the reign of William and Mary. This was life to England as the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was death to France. They will stand over against each other until the judgment, in everlasting contrast, as light and darkness. That evil stroke of the pen of Louis XIV. hurt France more than the defeats at Blenheim, Oudenarde and Malplaquet. That signature of William III. uplifted England more than all Marlborough's victories. And both mightily built up the Baptist power in England and her colonies.

4. Later in date but more far-reaching in power is William Carey's Foreign Mission Sermon. When he spoke, the sleeping world heard two far-off cries: one from heathen lands, "Come over and help US," and one from the Mount of Ascension: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And wherever and whenever since, oppression lifts its heavy hand from Baptist necks, and God sends revivals, they hear those two voices made audible by Carey's sermon. The cobbler's body lies moldering in the ground, but the cobbler's soul goes marching on.

And here allow me to isolate and emphasize one

significant fact. In the year 1800, yonder in Boston, was organized a Woman's Missionary Society, which contributed $150 to missions the first year. Happy presage of a glorious future! Right glad was I that my Brother Eaton corrected the statistics submitted in the recent Ecumenical Conference concerning woman's proportion of foreign mission work. Well do we know in this Convention the power of their co-operation.

5. Passing over to the New World, we next note the struggle for civil and religious liberty in America, culminating when the members of the old Philadelphia Association, then holding their 74th session, were roused at midnight by the watchman's cry: "Past 12 o'clock and all is well, and Cornwallis has surrendered!" Hence their resolution: "And now, dear brethren, we feel ourselves constrained to acknowledge the great goodness of God toward us, and to call on you to join with us in thankfulness and praise, as well for the unanimity and brotherly love which prevailed throughout our meeting as for the recent signal success granted to the American arms, in the surrender of the whole British army, under the command of Lord Cornwallis, with the effusion of so little blood."

Cornwallis surrendered October 19, 1781, at Yorktown, Virginia. This resolution was adopted in Philadelphia four days later. Happy people who are able to reckon unanimity and brotherly love

as great a cause for praise as the surrender of an enemy's army. Lord help us ever to keep the lesson in mind! I can never think back into this period of fiery trials without seeing pictures. They fill a gallery in my mind. I walk among them and look up at them with bared head, in awed silence, while my heart is burning. There they are. I can see them now. I see Roger Williams, an outcast, wandering in winter snows. I see the bared back of Obadiah Holmes, scarred with bloody stripes.

I see that disgraceful spoliation of my brethren at Ashfield—their orchards, yards, fields and the very graves of their dead sacrificed under forced sale to supply funds for a needless meeting-house of another denomination, and to pay this Pedobaptist preacher's salary—himself there bidding in their property for a song. And this only six years before the battle of Lexington, and not so very far from that historic field.

I see the venerable Isaac Backus at the meeting of the First Continental Congress, laboring vainly with the Massachusetts delegates in behalf of religious liberty for his persecuted people, and hear the reply of John Adams, that "you might as well attempt to turn the heavenly luminaries from their course as to ask Massachusetts to give up the union of church and state." In this year, 1800, Backus has yet seven years to live, and it will be twenty-seven years more before this unnatural union is

dissolved in Massachusetts. It will be 1820 before Connecticut has religious liberty.

But we are yet in the picture gallery. This time the scenes are from old Virginia: I see Lewis Craig, John Burrus, John Young, Edward Herndon, James Goolrick, Bartholomew Choning, Edwain Saunders and John Walker in jail for the crime of preaching the gospel without Episcopal license. I see letters written to them while incarcerated and their replies from behind prison bars. I hear them preaching through prison windows to friends gathered outside. I read the Baptist addresses and memorials and petitions addressed to the House of Burgesses, to the President of the United States. They bear familiar signatures: Samuel Harris, Reuben Ford, John Waller. I see the historic forms of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Patrick Henry giving better counsel and help than John Adams gave to Father Backus. Brethren, in the war of the Commonwealth in England, and in our Revolutionary War, the Baptists were all patriots. In a long list of published Tories there is not a Baptist name. Dearer than life to a Baptist is soul-liberty. They are like the grim Douglas who said that "the smell of one fagot on the Tay" would bring him back from the English marches.

And let me tell you that soul-liberty in these United States means soul-liberty one day for the whole world. And you may write this down and

ponder it: It was the struggle for civil and religious liberty that brought about that voluntary Baptist co-operation, which to-day enables our independent churches to elicit, combine and direct their resources in behalf of missions, education and fraternity. When they learned to co-operate voluntarily, without an autocratic pope, without a hierarchy, without a cast-iron organization, they settled the question of the ages. They took the divine precept, "Love the Brotherhood," and made it the centripetal force that would equalize the centrifugal force of church independence and the tangential force of individual liberty so as to bring about that circular motion which makes the orbits and preserves the harmony of the heavenly bodies.

Stand, therefore, by co-operation, as the one successful answer to the cavils of our enemies that Baptist polity, having no earthly head or graded hierarchy, can never accomplish the work of organization. But to hold together many widely scattered and free communities there must be some mighty work to do beyond the ability of the few and commensurate with the power of the many. As in the past we have these mighty works before us now: (a) protection against tyranny; (b) missions, home and foreign; (c) Christian education. Common necessities and mutual interests brought about that glorious union of the Separate and Regular Baptists and may they ever remain one and

indivisible! May differences on minor points never break up our unity!

And now let us for a moment inquire somewhat into the doctrines, discipline and comity of our churches one hundred years ago. In all essential particulars they were the same as now. There were differences on minor points, but great agreement on vital points. Their more important doctrines were: The plenary inspiration, sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scriptures. The divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ and his vicarious expiation.

The necessity of regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit arising from man's fall and total depravity. Salvation by grace, with all its kindred doctrines. Repentance and faith the terms of discipleship. Salvation essential to baptism, and not baptism essential to salvation. Baptism and church-membership essential to communion. A spiritual church. A distinct local church. An independent church. Interdependence of local churches for counsel and co-operation. The mission of the churches to preach the gospel to every creature. Co-operation of the churches for protection against tyranny, for missions and for education. Severance between church and state and soul-liberty. From the queries sent up to the associations and the answers returned, it is evident that their views of discipline accord in all essential points with ours to-day and that in comity they

were somewhat ahead of us now. But who were the leading men of 1800?

Truly "there were giants in those days." Look at them! In Europe were Carey, Fuller, Robert Hall, Christmas Evans and Carson. In the North stands the venerable Backus at the head of the list. With him are Manning, Stillman, Stanghtan, Gano and a host of others. In the South are John Leland, Andrew Broaddus, Semple, Richard Furman, Jesse Mercer, Henry Holcombe and many others. And what men they were in character and power! Who overtops them now?

And shall we not be called on to put forth all our strength to maintain the standards they established, and transmit unimpaired the priceless legacies they bequeathed? We have not space to write of their laymen and of that vast host of modest country preachers whose names are omitted from the historic page, but who snatched civil and religious freedom from tyranny's grasp, broke the bond uniting church and state, filled all the woods of the New World with campfires of revival and made every river, lake and pool bear testimony by baptism to the resurrection of the dead. Heaven is peopled by their converts, and myriad expectant cells of hell left forever vacant because of the brands they plucked from the burning. Let us glance at some of the coming men.

I speak of the boys of 1800. Ivieny is twenty-seven, Benedict twenty-one, Peck is eleven and

Cramp four years old. They will some day become historians of Baptist affairs. In North Carolina are two boys destined to greatness—William T. Brantly, Sr., thirteen years old, and Basil Manly, Sr., two years old. In South Carolina is a boy of eight, W. B. Johnson, who alone will wear the distinctive honor of presiding over both the Triennial and the Southern Baptist Conventions. Adiel Sherwood is nine years old. In 1827 he will preach a sermon that will cause four thousand penitents at one time to fall down before the throne of grace supplicating for mercy.

Adoniram Judson is twelve years old. Oh, the vaulting ambition, the soaring aspiration, the incorrigible pride of that boy! And how mightily he will wrestle with conquering grace before he surrenders his inordinate cravings for earthly honors to become wholly the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ—to become willing to be anything, to go anywhere and everywhere, to be consecrated body, soul and spirit to his Master's service. The Lord calls that kind sometimes to do great things. He called Saul of Tarsus. He called Adoniram Judson.

And there is a boy in England five years old—Sir Henry Havelock. He will be a mighty general in heathen lands. One of Carey's fellow-missionaries will baptize him. His regiment will be called "Havelock's Saints." They will equal the Ironsides of Cromwell. This man will place his lamps

in the laps of heathen gods, making them torch-bearers in their own temples while he and his men worship Jesus Christ. He will go as a deliverer to Lucknow, and, dying there, be in luck forever. And here is another boy thirteen years old, one Alexander Campbell, who will likely give you Baptists some trouble at a later day. Surely if the old Red Stone Association does not inquire into his case more carefully than I think it will, it will become necessary that some competent Virginian shall examine and re-examine him after a while. And here is another lad who will stir up things mightily later on. He will come from the frontiers of Georgia, without education, small in person, slovenly in dress, unprepossessing in appearance, with shriveled features and small piercing eyes. So J. M. Peck describes him. He is an Antinomian of Antinomians, assuming to speak from immediate inspiration. He will uproot the tender missionary gardens like a wild boar. He will oppose missions, education, Bible and temperance societies, prayer-meetings, Sunday-schools and all other evangelizing agencies with indescribable fury. He will take advantage of the prejudices of ignorance and the prevalent hyper-Calvinism and push his war into all the Southwest until in many associations of Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee the late-blossoming gardens of missionary work shall be as if a cold, chilling frost of

death had been breathed upon them. Who is this man? His name is Daniel Parker.

In 1826-7 he will publish his notorious "two seed" pamphlets, that will become his winding sheet and cause his memory to rot. Among many other boys who will become famous or infamous, I select only two other names. In Rockridge County, Virginia, is a boy of seven who will follow the flag of Andrew Jackson to Indian wars, who will be governor of Tennessee, then, suddenly leaving civilization, will naturalize as an Indian, then go to Texas, and in spite of the downfall of the Alamo and the massacre at Goliad, will snatch an empire at the battle of San Jacinto from the hands of Santa Anna, the Napoleon of the West, will become president of that new republic and hand back by annexation to the United States that vast territory now covered by Texas, the most of New Mexico, parts of the Indian Territory, Kansas, Colorado and Wyoming. The whole of it once ceded, but unclaimed in the Jefferson purchase, and now redeemed by bloody revolution.

That boy's name is Sam Houston, and on only a part of that territory now are 171 missionaries of this Convention and in it more Baptists than were in the world when Houston was a boy of seven. In Kentucky is another boy nine years old who will go to Texas, become a jurist and preacher, and, in the very year of this State Convention's organization, lay the foundation of that institution

which bears his name to-day. His name is R. E. B. Baylor, and Baylor University and the Texas Convention were born in 1845.

As space fails me, I must leave my subject where Tacitus left his German hero—on the middle of a bridge—with mighty controversies yet pending and with this unanswerable question: Who of the boys now living will make the twentieth-century Baptist world memorable?

IV

SERMONS ON THE RESURRECTION

FIRST SERMON

"And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay."—Matt. 28:5, 6.

THERE are two grand divisions of our Bible, so related and so interdependent that they stand or fall together. Either one apart from the other loses all sanctity and all obligation. Christians accept both of them as the inspired word of God, revealing all human relations to God and to each other, and all obligations arising from these relations, and all destiny determined by responsibility to observe these obligations; but if these books are not inspired they cannot make such revelations, nor create such obligations, nor entail such destiny, and in that case we have no Bible.

The book then becomes no more to us than any other piece of purely human literature. Yea, it is entitled to less respect upon our part than that which is rightly accorded to many books of human literature that make no false pretensions of divine origin. The entire religious value of the Bible, its whole spiritual profitableness to us and its only claim to be an authoritative standard, depend upon

its inspiration. The question of the inspiration of the Bible is, therefore, a vital and fundamental question. That settled, all other things relating to it are settled.

Not only so—and I pray you to mark this statement—if the satisfactory determination of the inspiration of the Bible lies beyond the reach of the average busy man, on account of either the vastness or complexity of the question, that is equivalent to making it a question which cannot be solved. For if, indeed, the nature or extent of the investigation of the subject of its inspiration renders a proper and timely solution possible to experts only, that alone destroys all its claims to inspiration. Hence there must be some simple and easy way of ascertainment and of assurance upon this point, or revelation cannot be revelation.

You may confidently assume that if a God of wisdom and love and power saw fit to reveal not merely important, but vital, matters to his creatures that he would not defeat the purpose of that revelation by putting the proofs of its being a revelation beyond the reach of the people who most need the assurance of that proof. Any proposed method of settling the question of the inspiration of the Bible which confessedly restricts its proof to a learned few may, therefore, be at once rejected, without any hesitation. I submit a simple method:

All the claims of the Old Testament part of our Bible to be the inspired word of God may rest upon

the proof of one historical fact, namely, its foretold Messiah has come. And all the claims of the New Testament part of our Bible to be the inspired word of God certainly rest on the proof of another simple historical fact, namely, that Jesus of Nazareth, claiming to be the Messiah of the Old Testament, has risen from the dead. In support of the first statement the following simple tests are submitted:

First:—The Old Testament Messiah must be an attested descendant of the first man, through Seth and Abraham and David. Hence the carefully kept genealogical tables of the whole Old Testament period, fully four thousand years. When this period ended proof of lineal descent from David could be made from these tables, but no Jew now living could be so attested. It follows that the Old Testament Messiah has either already come or the inspiration of the book fails. No future claimant could identify himself upon the point of descent.

Second:—The Old Testament Messiah must come before Judah loses all national rule and autonomy, for the prophecy of Jacob declares: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, till Shiloh come. To him belongs the obedience of the nations." But since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A.D. 70. Judah has been without national rule or country. A Shiloh coming since the time of Titus would be no Old Testament Shiloh, and could not on its

promises claim the obedience of the nations. Therefore, if the Messiah did not come before the fall of Jerusalem, Old Testament inspiration fails.

Third:—The Old Testament Messiah must come while the second temple is standing, for the prophetic compensation to those who sorrowed over its inferiority to Solomon's temple was that "the glory of the latter house should exceed the glory of the former," and that "the Messiah would come to that second temple and purify it." But that temple perished with Jerusalem, leaving not one stone upon another. For more than 1,800 years there has been no temple. Therefore, either the Old Testament Messiah did come before the destruction of the temple, or its inspiration fails.

Fourth:—In the days of Daniel's fourth empire the God of Heaven, himself and not by agent, but personally, as the Messiah, was to set up a perpetual kingdom on earth; but Daniel's fourth empire passed away ages ago, and though it took Rome seven hundred years to die, it is dead. A Messiah, therefore, who came not in the time of the Roman supremacy is no Old Testament Messiah. If, therefore he has not come already, Old Testament inspiration fails.

Yet, again, the Old Testament Messiah, though a Jew, must be an ensign for the gathering of the Gentiles. The peoples of all other nations must recognize his spiritual supremacy. If, therefore, history cannot identify some Jew, attested as a

lineal descendant of David, coming in the days of the Roman empire, coming while Judah yet retains some mark of national rule, coming while the second temple is still standing and after coming establishing a kingdom yet in existence and to whose King the other nations of the world look as a Saviour and ruler, then Old Testament inspiration fails.

Yet again, the whole Old Testament economy was confessedly but a shadow of better things to come. All its institutions of type and ritual were appointed to stand until the substance came. Its temple and sacrifices were to abide until set aside by what they signified. And very clearly does it fix the date when sacrifice and oblation shall cease, when vision and prophecy shall be sealed up, when reconciliation for sin shall be effected, when everlasting righteousness shall be brought in, when the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself.

Now, since we know that at this time no sacrifice for sins smokes upon any Jewish altar, and all its prophetic oracles are dumb, and since the types have perished at the precise time appointed, if no Messiah has come as the great anti-typical sacrifice, then Old Testament inspiration fails.

Finally, the Old Testament predicts repeatedly, and with great precision, that the chosen people would be rejected, their temple destroyed, their city trampled underfoot of other nations, themselves dispersed among all nations, though not destroyed,

abiding many days without a king, without a prince, without a sacrifice, without a pillar, without an ephod or priest, or teraphim or prophet, and yet preserved in continual persecution as a distinct people—and all this calamity because they would reject their Messiah coming at the time and in the manner designated by their prophets, and that this state of dispersion and persecution should last until they accepted the Messiah that they had rejected.

So that if these particulars have failed, or any one of them, or if in the 1,800 years since this great calamity came upon their nation, it can be established by historical proof that they have returned to their land, restored their government, rebuilt their temple, reinstituted their priesthood and its sacrifices, and yet not accepted the Messiah which they rejected, then Old Testament inspiration fails.

Even the most carping hypercriticism will not affirm that the interpretation of all these seven distinct lines of thought is unnatural. In every case that interpretation has been given which the language itself naturally suggests to the average mind, but by any one of these lines of thought the inspiration of the Old Testament may be sufficiently attested for all practical purposes. That is to say, one does not have to travel over all the roads which lead to London in order to get there. Any one of them will suffice.

These seven lines of thought have been selected

out of a multitude equally good, because the test in each case is so very simple, and in every case is a matter of historical proof. So that we may safely conclude that all claims of Old Testament inspiration rest upon the proof of one historical fact, namely, that its foretold Messiah has come. But if Jesus of Nazareth be not this Old Testament Messiah no other Jew need set up a claim. It will not be denied that he claimed to be the Messiah in all four of the distinct phases of Messiahship, prophet, priest, king and sacrifice. Nor will it be denied that he testified on oath before God in the most solemn manner, when adjured by the high priest, that he was that Messiah.

In like manner we now proceed to show that all New Testament claim of inspiration rests upon the proof of another simple historical fact, namely, that Jesus of Nazareth, claiming to be the Messiah of the Old Testament, did arise from the dead. Though all of the seven previous lines of thought focus on Jesus of Nazareth and upon him alone—that is to say, in his case proof was established by the genealogical tables that he was a lineal descendant of David; that he did come in the days of the Roman empire; that he did come while Judah still retained some marks of nationality; that he did visit the second temple time; that he has been an ensign for the gathering of the Gentiles; that he did fulfill the Jewish types and that since rejecting him and in accordance with his own proph-

ecy, their temple has been destroyed and their nationality lost; now, although all these focus in himself alone and constitute an argument of no slight force to a fair mind, yet he himself, while living, and in answer to a direct challenge of his claim, appointed as the one supreme test of that claim that after they put him to death he would arise from the dead.

It is, therefore, quite needless to multiply or to complicate issues. All controversies between Christians upon the one hand and the opposers of Christianity, of whatever name, throughout the universe, on the other hand, may be narrowed to one decisive battlefield. The whole case compacts itself as a single kernel into one nutshell of historical fact. If Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead at the date previously assigned by himself, and as a proof of his claim, then he is no impostor nor a deluded enthusiast. God would not raise from the dead one who made such a blasphemous claim, one who was an impostor. So that if he did rise from the dead he is divine. If he be divine just one word from him authenticated the inspiration of both Testaments. The Testaments being inspired by that fact become the supreme standard of human conduct and creed and thought by which the world will be judged and eternal destiny fixed.

Let us, therefore, glance rapidly at the proof that he himself, while living, did propose this test, and that the challenge was accepted, and that the dem-

onstration did come in the way claimed. I read six distinct statements of this proposed issue at different periods of his life here upon the earth, the first early in his ministry, the last at the close of his ministry. This proves that it was no afterthought, but that from the beginning he recognized this to be the crucial point upon which all of his claims depended.

When early in his ministry he came suddenly to his temple, in fulfillment of prophecy, and when by virtue of the authority claimed he scourged from that temple the robbers and thieves who held it, then they demanded a sign of his authority. I read it from the second chapter of John, commencing at the eighteenth verse: "The Jews therefore answered and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. The Jews, therefore (not understanding), said, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When, therefore, he was risen from the dead his disciples remembered that he spake this, and they believed in the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said." It is admitted that when here he first set forth his test, they misapprehended his language.

I read the next instance in the order of time, and from the twelfth chapter of Matthew: He is

now in Galilee and not in Jerusalem. "Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonah; for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the body of the whale, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." This time they did not misunderstand him, as will be clearly shown later.

I cite the next instance in which the test was presented, reading from the sixteenth chapter of Matthew: "From that time Jesus began to shew unto his disciples how that he must go into Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up." Mark's record and Luke's record accord exactly with this record by Matthew. This time the test was not proposed to his enemies, but to his friends, to his disciples, but through his disciples the knowledge of it rapidly reached his enemies.

In the order of history I read the next instance from the seventeenth chapter of Matthew: "And while they abode in Galilee Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up. And they were exceedingly sorry."

I read the next presentation of the test in the order of the history, and this time from the tenth chapter of John. He had just told them that he was the good shepherd, and would lay down his life for the sheep, adding the significant statement: "No one taketh my life away from me, but I lay it down myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up again. This is the commandment I received from my Father. There arose a division therefore among the Jews because of these words."

I cite the next instance. This time Matthew, Mark and Luke all record it. I read from the twentieth chapter of Matthew, commencing at the seventeenth verse: "Now as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem he took the twelve disciples apart while on the way, and he said to them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles to mock and to scourge and to crucify, and the third day he shall be raised up."

After these citations it is necessary to show you how this proposed test, that is, the proof of one historical fact, was considered by his enemies. I now read from the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew. He is hanging on the cross. He has been delivered up, and they are putting him to death, and while he is dying they say this: "And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and

saying, Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it again in three days, save thyself."

I submit a much more conclusive statement. He is now dead. Those who have had charge of his execution have officially certified that he is dead. His body has been taken down from the cross, pronounced dead by the official executioner, received as dead by his friends, both hands and feet pierced and a spear driven into his heart; cold and dead, and he had been put in the grave and an immense stone rolled to the mouth of that sepulchre. I read from the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew, commencing at the sixty-second verse: "Now on the morrow, which is the day after the Preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, We remember that this deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply his disciples come and steal him away and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; and the last error will be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them: Ye have a guard. Go your way, make it as sure as you can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stones and setting a watch."

Now I submit to you if I have not proved from this book that while he was alive he himself rested all of his claims upon the proof of one historical fact, and that he gave this as the sign, and that the

challenge was accepted by his enemies? They understood its significance. They did not understand the resurrection of the dead, as some moderns claim, to mean regeneration. They did not understand it to mean the deliverance of the soul from the body at the dissolution of the body. They understood it to apply to the body and not to the soul. They brought no word to Pilate as to the whereabouts of his disembodied soul. They sought not to seal up the gate that hides the invisible world. They sealed a grave. They established a guard to see that the body should not be wrested from the grave. They understood his test to be that his body, put to death upon the cross, would rise from the dead upon the third day, and any man who talks about the resurrection meaning any other thing does violence to the literal, primary and commonly accepted signification of the word, and advertises himself as incompetent to deal with a critical question.

Now, let us see where we stand. First, according to these records, there was a Jew named Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed to be the Messiah of the Old Testament; second, that the scribes and the Pharisees disputed his claim, demanding a sign; third, that he, while living, repeatedly to his friends, and repeatedly to his enemies and in answer to the demand that one who made such claims should have some adequate credentials, must furnish some proof of such high claim, gave as his credentials, as the authentication of his mission, as the divine estab-

lishment of his divinity, that after they put him to death on the third day he would rise again.

The record shows that they did take him, and try him, and condemn him, and crucify him, and that the authentication of his death was everything that evidence could supply. You cannot meet this question by saying that he only seemed to be dead, and his alleged resurrection merely a resuscitation of suspended life. A Roman centurion, charged with the execution of the prisoner, who goes back to the one in authority and reports that this prisoner has been executed and is dead, would make no mistake upon a point of that kind. You could not consistently affirm that anyone now sleeping in our cemetery is dead and then deny the sufficiency of the evidence that the man Jesus of Nazareth died and was buried. So thus far we are clear.

I cite next the Scripture in connection with the text. The third day is just about to dawn, the critical hour, the precise time. The lesson reads: "Now late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earthquake; for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled back the stone from the door and sat upon it. His countenance was as lightning, and his raiment as white as snow. And for fear of him the watchers did shake and become as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the

women, Fear not ye, for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, for he is risen, as he said."

So that we have come to this fact, that at the time designated by the test, the tomb is empty, the body is gone. So far there has been perfect agreement upon every fact stated: there was a man named Jesus of Nazareth; he claimed to be the Messiah of the Old Testament; he was challenged to give a sign that would authenticate his high claim; he did fix this as the sign and specified the time of the test; that he did die, he was buried, and at the appointed time, though a guard stood there to prevent imposture, the body is gone. What, then, became of the body of Jesus of Nazareth? If he did not rise either the Jews got the body or the disciples got it. The Jews were in this dilemma: If they took that body away why didn't they exhibit it as dead and identify it as the very body that had been crucified, and disprove all claim of the resurrection?

To say that the disciples took away the dead body forces a question of unavoidable logic: What did they want with it dead? What could they do with it dead? What purpose would it answer for them? They felt that the battle was lost. They were cowed to death. They supposed that they were orphaned. What courage could come into their hearts by stealing that body, then lying with reference to it, and

then destroying it so that it never could be found? A man's gullibility must be huge to believe that these cowed disciples stole that body and reported that he was risen from the dead.

So the important question is now fairly stated. In the following sermon the evidence will be examined, and in a subsequent discourse the reasonableness of the test proposed by Jesus will be shown.

V

SERMONS ON THE RESURRECTION

SECOND SERMON

"To whom also he showed himself alive after his death by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."—Acts 1:3.

YOU will recall in the preceding sermon that I thought it important to show from the word of God that our Lord Jesus Christ when he was alive, at six different times—three times with his enemies and three times with his friends—especially fixed the test of his Messiahship, and that that test was that he would rise from the dead.

Three other things occurred in his lifetime bearing upon the same subject, all of them of tremendous signification. The first is the institution of the ordinance of baptism, which has no signification apart from the resurrection of the dead, it being a picture of a burial and an emergence from the grave. That this institution was appointed before he died, that it was appointed for perpetual obligation, showed the clearest apprehension in his mind of the nature of the test and the worth of this monumental evidence.

The second is the institution of the Lord's Supper, whose only hope is in the resurrection of the

dead. In the very act of commemorating his death he assures them that he will drink this wine anew with them in his Father's kingdom, and that while this ordinance is to be a perpetual obligation and points significantly backward, it also points still more significantly to the future, in that it was to be observed until he came again. For 1,900 years these two monuments have stood in the eyes of the world. The third thing was that when they were saddened over the clear announcement of his departure from them by death, he gave them an assurance based upon his resurrection that he would not leave them always; that when he rose from the dead and reached his Father's house, he would send the Holy Spirit, whose coming would confer upon them power to do all he had commanded them to do.

Thus the institution of baptism and the supper as perpetual ordinances and the promise of the Holy Spirit all conditioned on his resurrection, take their place with the test six times preannounced. That a mere man, and particularly that an impostor, would make such conditions of faith in himself is inconceivable.

Our former sermon closed at the grave of Jesus, and at the empty grave of Jesus. We stopped at the disappearance of the dead body that had been put in the grave, and with the question pending, What became of that body? I have never heard of but two theories concerning the disposition of the

dead body of our Lord Jesus Christ. Both of the theories are possible. Both of them make allegations legitimately belonging to the domain of testimony; that is, they are matters upon which testimony may be received and susceptible of sufficient proof.

The first theory is set forth in the following language: "Some of the guard came into the city and told unto the chief priests all of the things that were come to pass"; that is, they told the chief priests that an earthquake came, and that there was a dazzling appearance of an angel from heaven, and that they fell down like dead men, and that when they arose from that prostration by the power of the heavenly messenger the grave was empty. Those were the facts they recited to the chief priests. Then the record adds: "And when the chief priests were assembled with the elders and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the guards, saying, Tell ye that his disciples came by night and stole him away while ye slept, and if this come to the governor's ears we will persuade him and rid you of all care. So they took the money and did as they were taught, and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews and continueth until this day." This first theory, therefore, was that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was stolen by night by his disciples and stolen for the purpose of making a claim that he was raised.

This was a possible solution of the question, and

it was an allegation that could be sustained by adequate testimony. We know that there have been such things as robbers of graves. We know of many historical instances where dead bodies have been taken from the grave for some purpose; medical students, for example, who carry them to the dissecting table, or robbers, whose object is to obtain a large ransom from the afflicted relatives. So then, if the evidence is sufficient there is nothing in the theory itself to make it objectionable. The witnesses are sufficient in number. That guard constituted enough witnesses to prove any fact, so far as numbers go. The only thing is that what they testify must be subjected to the rules of evidence such as are commonly recognized among men. Let us look, then, at their statement.

They first gave a different account. In the second place, they accepted a bribe of a large sum of money to put this theory in circulation. In the third place, what they finally allege was absolutely impossible, so far as their knowledge could go, to wit, that the disciples stole that body while they were asleep. If they were asleep they could not testify as to any disposition of the body. They could not prove that anyone removed that body. Moreover, on the face of it, their last story is exceedingly improbable, namely, that when a special guard had been detailed for the express purpose of preventing the very thing which they now allege did take place, and when the very time had been

given to them when they must be most particular in their vigils, it is unreasonable to suppose that a guard so appointed would have relaxed their vigilance.

It becomes more improbable from the death penalty assigned to a Roman sentinel who went to sleep upon the post of duty. It is still more improbable from the fact that no adequate motive can be suggested or conceived of why the disciples should want this dead body. It would be of no use to them. So that as far as this theory goes, and it is one of the only two that have ever been advanced, we may at once reject it.

Now, what is the other theory? The other theory is that Jesus himself rose from the dead: the particular point upon which human testimony is to be brought is not to show the processes by which he overcame death and brought back life to himself. No witness is introduced who alleges that he actually saw him rise from the dead. The only thing upon which they are to bear testimony is that they did see him alive after he was dead. Here we are met by a pertinent and important inquiry: Is the thing concerning which evidence is to be introduced a legitimate matter for evidence? I take it for granted that there are no other things upon which human testimony is accepted more readily than upon these two points: First, that a man is dead, and second that a man is alive. We accept evidence upon both of those points and act upon that evi-

dence on innumerable occasions. It is oftentimes necessary to prove death. It is oftentimes necessary to prove life. In either case, it is easy to be understood what amount of testimony is sufficient to prove that death has taken place, or to prove that a man is alive.

The evidence of his death is abundant, official, and has never been denied. Therefore let us look at the evidence that Jesus showed himself alive after his death to his apostles and others. There are extant four independent histories of Jesus of Nazareth, written by contemporaries, and written while multitudes who also knew him personally were yet alive. There are extant also twenty-three other books, written by contemporaries, and written while thousands were yet alive who personally knew Jesus Christ. I refer to the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. The most notable event in all of these records is that Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead. To this fact, according to these records, hundreds and thousands of eyewitnesses bear testimony, and who counted it the chief business of their subsequent life to repeat that evidence.

In other words, henceforth their life mission was to be witnesses of the resurrection. Fifteen distinct appearances of our Lord Jesus Christ, at least, are given in the New Testament, perhaps more, including the several appearances to Paul, to Stephen and to John on the Island of Patmos. But there are

ten distinct appearances mentioned in these four histories.

These appearances, many of them, are connected with the most minute details of identification of the body. Sometimes he appeared to just one, as to Mary Magdalene, to Peter, to James. Sometimes he appeared to two, then again to three, then again to seven, then to ten, then to eleven and finally to five hundred at one time. These appearances covered a period of forty days. Some of them were in the morning, some of them at brightest midday, some of them at night; some in the house, some out in the road, some in the suburbs and some in the city of Jerusalem; some by the sea and some on the mountains of Galilee. Speaking collectively of these witnesses, they saw him often. They ate with him just as they had done before his death. They heard him often in both brief and long-sustained conversation. They witnessed closely every familiar mannerism of speech and tone and gesture. They handled him critically, touching the prints of the well-known wounds received at his crucifixion, and feeling of his flesh and of his bones, to assure themselves that a material substance was before them.

And this, too, by those who knew him most intimately in his lifetime, those who could least easily be mistaken as to the identity of his person, including his own skepticism as to his resurrection, well-nigh incorrigible, and their tremendous interests at

stake, required upon their part the most patient and exhaustive examination, and demanded abundant and infallible proof, not only to the bodily senses of sight, of hearing and touch, and to the keener mental tests of memory, intuition and reason, but to that more subtle and more satisfactory proof, spiritual recognition. They must not only know positively, unmistakably and absolutely that this was the very body which had died and was buried and was now alive, but also that it was reanimated by the same spirit which warmed it before death, so that in every respect, and beyond all possibility of doubt, this was the same person, the same Jesus who had been their teacher, and also that he possessed and made over to them power to do things that would make that resurrection a declaration that he was the Son of God with power.

In all the cases of the establishment of identity known to history there has never been one where the proof has been so abundant, so critical and so comprehensive, covering all departments of investigation, nor where the testimony was so unequivocal and so consistent. If these witnesses could not establish the proof that Jesus was alive, then no evidence could possibly prove any man to be alive.

So that you have before you the two theories and the evidence upon which those two theories rest; the first that the disciples stole the dead body, and next, that Jesus showed himself alive to his people after his death, not only by proofs, but many proofs,

not only by many proofs, but by many infallible proofs.

I submit the following fundamental rules which govern matters of evidence: First, "In trials of fact by oral testimony the proper inquiry is, not whether it is possible that the testimony may be false, but whether there is sufficient probability that it is true." Second, "A proposition of fact is proved when its truth is established by competent and satisfactory evidence." Third, "In the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is to be presumed credible until the contrary is shown, the burden of impeaching his credibility lying on the objector." Fourth, "The credit due to the testimony of witnesses depends upon, firstly, their honesty; secondly, their ability; thirdly, their number and the consistency of their testimony; fourthly, the conformity of their testimony with experience; and fifthly, the coincidence of their testimony with collateral circumstances."

Now if we apply these four rules of evidence to what is said concerning the stealing of his body, that statement goes to the wall. If we apply them to the evidence that Jesus showed himself alive after death to his people, no sane man can question that the requirements of every one of them is met in every particular. The honesty of these witnesses cannot be impeached. Their ability of competency depends upon their being acquainted previously with the person of Jesus Christ, their having good sense

enough to recognize one whom they had previously known, and their opportunities for seeing the one who is identified by their testimony.

There can be no question of the competency of these witnesses. There is nothing in their testimony that bears on its face suspicion. What, let me ask you, can create a suspicion against this evidence? It is consistent. What one says is consistent with what another says. Now let us look at these people who gave this evidence, and see if in all the collateral circumstances what they say is affirmed. For these men to state that Jesus was alive meant that they must take upon themselves the lifetime obligation of the publication of the fact of his resurrection; that to do this they must go counter to the world, its pleasures, its habits, its business; that they must entail upon themselves the most grievous burdens in life and the greatest hazards of death. They joyfully assume all these responsibilities. When they speak of Jesus as risen they impress every man that hears it with their sincerity. They testify it before kings, and the kings tremble as they listen. They testify it when chained to the martyr's stake, and while the flames are burning their bodies, and with shouts and hosannas of triumph they declare in their own dying agonies that Jesus is risen. No amount of intimidation was ever able to shake their testimony. It was tried by imprisonment, tried by stripes, tried by poverty, tried by fire, tried by casting them to the ravenous, wild

beasts in the Roman Amphitheater, and in every way possible to human effort; many experiments of the most excruciating kind were resorted to to shake the testimony of these men and these women.

I submit that if any man with an unbiased mind will read the Acts of the Apostles and see how that narrative glows, he will feel the power of these men giving this evidence. But we come now to another question in connection with it. Our Lord had told them in the last interview had with them there should come a confirmation that neither earth, heaven nor hell could doubt. He said, "I go to my Father, and if I go I will send upon you the Holy Spirit." The history recites that ten days from that time a most remarkable transaction occurred openly in the city of Jerusalem. There were certain things visible in connection with it. Tongues as of fire seemed to rest upon their heads. There was the further remarkable phenomenon that these fishers of Galilee were able, under his power bestowed upon them, to speak in the languages of all of the nations of the earth, as if they had been born and reared in those tongues. It was evident that a power characterized them utterly foreign to their previous experience, and when they were called upon to explain, what was their explanation? Let me read it to you.

"Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did

by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know:

"Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was not possible that he should be holden of it, and he hath shed forth this which ye see and hear."

They gave no other account of their power. They could heal the sick. They could raise the dead. They could perform other wonders impossible to men not spirit endued. They distinctly disclaimed that the power rested in themselves, and affirmed that it came to them from the risen and ascended and glorified Lord Jesus Christ.

The next question to be determined is, what significance did they attach to this doctrine of the resurrection? How important was it in their sight? How much in their judgment was involved in that issue? I read first from the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Paul is standing on Mars Hill, and he says: "The times of this ignorance God overlooked, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Is there to be a judgment, and must all men

stand before that divine bar and answer for the deeds which are done in the body? The only proof that there will be a judgment is the resurrection of the dead. Is there a heaven? There is but one proof of it, that Jesus when alive said to his people, "I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. In my Father's house are many mansions." Or let us read from the fifteenth chapter of the first letter to the Corinthians, where this doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is specifically discussed. I commence at the twelfth verse:

"Now, if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?

"But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen:

"And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and is also your faith vain.

"Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.

"For, if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised:

"And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.

"Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

When ever before in issues made by men has there been such a readiness to stake everything upon one single fact; such an openness to concede that preaching is vain; faith is vain; forgiveness of sin is a falsehood; your fathers and mothers who died, perished; there is no judgment; there is no heaven; there is no hell; there is no hope; if there is no resurrection of the dead?

It is a matter of unspeakable sadness to me, particularly in the case of young people, to hear them speak lightly of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. And there are some who imagine that they can be skeptical upon this point and remain Christians. Is there anything left of Christianity with this surrendered? If its preaching be vain, if its faith be vain, if there be no such thing as the forgiveness of sin, if there be no such thing as the judgment, if there be no such place as hell, if all who have professed it are now utterly annihilated in their graves, what infinitesimal shred of Christianity is left?

When you say that you are only skeptical concerning the resurrection of the dead, you mean or ought to mean, that you are skeptical about the whole matter, in its height and width and length and breadth, in its center, in its solidarity and in its circumstances. You do not believe any of it. There is nothing to profess if you deny this doc-

trine. So far the discussion has been restricted to the resurrection of the body of Jesus Christ and necessarily has shown the relation between his resurrection and the inspiration of the Scriptures.

The two subjects cannot be considered apart. They stand or fall together. In our next sermon will be considered the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as it applies to us, and the reasons given so far as Scripture light shines upon the subject, why this particular test of all others in the world was made the proof of Christianity, and a reply submitted to objections to the doctrine based upon exegesis or upon science.

VI

SERMONS ON THE RESURRECTION

THIRD SERMON

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."—John 5:25-29.

THE occasion of the deliverance which constitutes this text was restoration to perfect health of a man afflicted for thirty-eight years with the infirmity of impotence, brought about by sin. The man's vital powers were all so wasted that recovery by nature or by medical skill was impossible. The restoration, therefore, was a miracle, by a word, instant, permanent. Such a case of healing is equivalent to life from the dead, since it involves creative power.

Hence our Lord's explanation of it in these words: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." It is in this connection that he utters these words of the text: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of

God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here, evidently, are two resurrections; one that now is, and one that is to come; one a resurrection of the soul from spiritual death, the other a resurrection of the body from physical death. Both resurrections are effected by the Son of God, who has become the Son of man, and following the resurrection from the physical death comes the general judgment.

This text, therefore, prepares the way for an orderly and complete statement of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. I ask you to read carefully every term of this statement of the doctrine. While the Scriptures describe the future restoration of Israel as a symbolic restoration (in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel and in the eleventh chapter of the letter to the Romans), and while they describe the impartation of life to the soul in regeneration as a spiritual resurrection (as in the first part of this text, and in the second chapter of the letter to the Ephesians), they also

declare that at the second coming of Christ there shall be a resurrection of the body, and a reunion of the raised body with the selfsame spirit from which death separated us; that both the just and the unjust shall have part in this resurrection; that to the just it shall be a resurrection unto life, and the body shall be like Christ's body, fitted for the eternal use of the sanctified spirit.

To the unjust it shall be a resurrection unto condemnation, and the body shall be fitted for the eternal uses of an unsanctified spirit; that this resurrection of the just and of the unjust shall be followed by the general judgment, whose final and irrevocable decree fixes forever the alignment and status of the whole human family. It is important to know that this statement of the doctrine forbids the restriction of the term "resurrection" to a figurative import, while it concedes the figurative usage of the word in some cases, and that it forbids the restriction of the term to any change whatever that the soul may undergo, though it concedes a spiritual resurrection; that it forbids a restriction of the term to the resurrection of the bodies of the just, in that it insists that there shall be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust.

To avoid all possible ambiguity, even at the risk of tedious repetition, the resurrection of the dead, now under consideration, applies to the outer, not to the inner man. It means that the corruptible body shall put on incorruption; that the mortal

body shall be swallowed up in immortality. It does not mean the spirit's release by dissolution of the body, as a butterfly emerges into larger life by its escape from the chrysalis state. This would be to make death both the date and the means of the resurrection. It does not mean the quickening of the spirit in regeneration, nor any part, or process, or consummation of the sanctification of the spirit. Nor does it mean any gradual change taking place in the renewal of our bodies now by natural processes.

It announces a definite, instantaneous, future event, so entirely without what we call the realm of nature that it must be classed essentially as a miracle of supernatural power, indeed, the greatest of miracles. This general resurrection of human bodies is based entirely upon the resurrection of Christ's body, to which resurrection of Christ his churches look back as the source of their light, and which irresistibly carries with it all other miracles of the Scriptures, and constitutes the irrefutable proof that these Scriptures are the inspired words of God, thus leaving no room for any misconception of the import of the doctrine.

Let us now carefully review its historic and philosophic foundations. We may rest assured that our Lord prescribed no arbitrary and unsuitable test of his divinity. When he selected the sign of Jonas as the one sign establishing his divine credentials and authenticating his doctrine as from

heaven, it was because that sign and no other fitted the requirements of the case.

A profound philosophy will be found to underlie the necessity for this specific demonstration of his divinity and of the inspiration of the Scriptures. And what is that philosophy? The philosophy of a thing is the reason of the thing. What reason, therefore, imperiously demanded this proof of Christ's divinity? The answer is easy to find, and when found is easy to understand. It consists of the following three elements:

First, the normal personality of the first man, body and soul, as originally created, with the purpose and provision of God that the body should be perpetuated. Second, the fall or death of that man, in both body and soul, through Satanic seduction. Third, the promise of a redeemer, the seed of a woman, who would destroy the work of the devil and restore man to his normal condition of soul and body. That is the philosophic ground of the text. The Scripture record, the Old Testament Scriptures, by which the Messiahship must be tested, clearly shows that the first man was a dual being. His body, indeed, was fashioned of earthly matter. His soul was inbreathed.

There was an inner and an outer man, and this dual being was the normal man. Both constituents are necessary to the make-up of man. Neither apart from the other constitutes a man. This is the first fact of human history, according to this Book,

concerning the human race. The second fact is that by the appointed use of the tree of life, placed in the Garden of Eden, to which man had access as long as he was steadfast in his probation, provision was made for the perpetuity of his body, showing that God purposed that the body should live as long as the soul which inhabits it. Now, the intent of the Creator is the law of the creature. What purpose was in God's mind when he made anything or any being is the law of that thing or that being, and when the Creator made man, making him dual, body and soul, and purposed and provided for the continuity of his body, that intent marks the boundaries of man and becomes the law of his being. His intent was that man's body should live forever, and adequate provision was made for it. Now, such is man as he appears on the first sacred historic page. Look at him! in the image of his Creator, partly mortal, and yet the mortal, by the provision of a probation, to become immortal, and body and soul live forever.

The third fact is that man failed in his probation through the seduction of the devil, and was cut off from access to the tree of life, lest, as God says, "He now eat of that tree and live forever." The body, shut out from the means of perpetuity, hastened to dissolution. Thus the whole man fell. His soul by alienation from God became dead in sin. His mortal body, separated from the tree of life, returned to the dust as it was. It is im-

portant here to make clear the meaning of mortality and immortality as predicated of the body.

When we say the body is mortal, we do not mean that its constituent elements shall ever perish,—matter is indestructible,—but we mean that the organism or form in which those elements cohere and constitute an animate form is mortal. When we say an immortal body, we do not mean that its particles of matter exist forever, though this is true, but we mean that the organism or form in which these particles of matter cohere lives forever as an animate form. It is quite important to note what is meant by the mortality of the body and immortality of the body. The body is a living organism. When, therefore, our Lord claimed to be the Messiah of the Old Testament he well knew what character of proof was requisite to establish his claim. Because the children of men were partakers of flesh and blood he likewise partook of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and through his death deliver them who all their lifetime were subject to bondage through fear. He must show that one traveler has returned from that bourne which swallowed up the bodies of all the rest. If he cannot show that, he is not the Messiah. He could not be declared the Son of God with power except by the rising of his body from the death, and this rising—mark this point—this rising must be to die no more. It must not be like the rising

of the girl whose hand he took and the maid arose. She died afterwards. It must not be like the rising of the widow's son at Nain, whom he spoke unto life and gave back to his mother. He died again. It must not be like the rising when he stood at the mouth of the sepulchre full of corruption and said, "Lazarus, come forth," for Lazarus died again. The risen body must be made immortal.

Any resurrection like that of Lazarus, to be followed by death again, no matter how remote that death might be, would not meet the requirements of the case. The original man, according to God's intent, was to have an immortal body. All mortality must be eliminated. He then, the firstfruits from the dead, must be able to say, as he did say: "I am he that liveth and was dead and will die no more. And I have the key of death and of hell." In no other way could he bruise the serpent's head. In no other way could he win back all that man had lost, and restore man to the full fruition of God's original purpose concerning him. Why, then, did he impose this test and no other? Because this and no other meets the requirements of the case. A Messiah who left out half of God's original purpose has forever failed. A Messiah to save only a part of each man would not be the Old Testament Messiah.

There was, therefore, profound philosophy behind his reply to a challenge for a sign adequate

to authenticate his claim when he said, "No sign shall be given but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and nights in the body of the whale, so must the Son of man be three days and nights in the body of the earth, and on the third day he shall rise again."

The historic and philosophic reason of this test thus made, we next inquire on what ground may we rest the fulfillment of such a test. The test requires that a body which had died shall rise from the grave, rise immortal, rise to die no more. On what ground can you rest that test? From the nature of the test there can be but one ground, namely, the power of God. If there be a God, he is omnipotent. An omnipotent God can raise the dead.

Therefore to the Sadducees, when they denied the doctrine of the resurrection, he said: "You do err, not knowing the scriptures, neither the power of God." Let me read you the foundation on which this doctrine rests. To Moses God said: "I kill and I make alive." In the book of Samuel God says: "The Lord killeth and maketh alive. He bringeth down to the grave and he bringeth up from the grave." Therefore, in sending out his apostles, and knowing what intimidation would be brought to bear upon their naturally cowardly natures, he pointed out to them the true objects of fear and said: "Fear not him who can kill the body but cannot kill the soul, but fear him who

after he hath killed the body can destroy both soul and body forever in hell."

Well might you doubt if one affirmed that man could raise the dead. Well might you be skeptical if one affirmed that Nature by her own inherent powers provides for the resurrection of the dead. But in the language of the great apostolic logician, "Why should it be thought by you a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?" It is incredible that man can raise the dead. It is incredible that nature provides for a resurrection. It is incredible that God should raise the dead. And the doctrine of the resurrection rests exclusively upon the power of God, and whoever denies the doctrine of the resurrection errs by not knowing the power of God.

And to what purpose is all the vast array of testimony from human scientists declaring that they cannot find the resurrection of the dead by telescope, or microscope, or scalpel, or crucible? What fool ever said they could? Their investigation cannot go beyond the realm of nature. The resurrection is without the realm of nature. Confessedly it is supernatural.

And do you suppose that any Christian would rejoice or vaunt himself if the resurrection by scientific demonstration could be proved and located in the realm of nature? Mark the words. Listen to the statement. Let it sink down into your hearts. When scientists can make that proof they have

destroyed Christianity. Does any skeptic on scientific grounds suppose for a moment that he harms Christianity by his failure to find the resurrection in nature? Let him disabuse his mind. If he wants to shoot a gun that will crumble all the foundations of Christianity, let him prove by a scientific demonstration the resurrection of the dead.

The sole value of the resurrection as a test of Christ's divinity and of the inspiration of the Scriptures lies in its supernaturalism. It must essentially be by a miracle. It must be something that God only can do. Any man may say, "I lay down my life," but only Jesus Christ could say, "I lay down my life and I take it up again."

It is pertinent to close this discussion by introducing the witness of prophecy. Let us look at some of the prophetic facts, for a fact does not stand by itself. It is sure to cast a shadow in some direction. It is not merely a memorial post of a past event, but a future forecast. It indicates what can be.

With this view let us look at a series of facts. First, all miraculous cases of healing in both Testaments. The element of miracle enters where the powers of nature and of science stop. Any kind of bodily or mental sickness beyond the recuperative powers of nature and also of medical skill that is cured, must be cured by a miracle, and that miracle will have an important signification. When such a case is healed in a moment of time by a word or by

a touch, it involves the exercise of creative power, and forecasts the redemption of the body. It argues not only divine sympathy for physical and mental pain, not only hints at the intrinsic value of the human body as an integral part of the normal man, but it prophesies the ultimate salvation of the body.

Hence a characteristic feature of the Old Testament Messiah is that he himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses. Hence the prophet says, "At his coming the eyes of the blind shall be opened, the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as an hart and the tongue of the dumb sing."

Hence, when John in prison was doubting and sent his disciples with the inquiry to Jesus, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" it happened while his messengers stood by that Jesus cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight, and he returned this answer: "Go your way. Tell John what things ye have seen and heard. The blind receive their sight; the lame walk; lepers are cleansed; the deaf hear; the dead are raised up; the poor have the gospel preached to them. Blessed is he who shall find no occasion for stumbling in me."

In other words, the proof of the Messiah is the helping of the human body by counteracting the dreadful effects of sin upon the human body, and shall the Messiah's work stop at temporary relief?

Shall he by touch give sight to an eye that shall one day be blind forever? Shall he speak to an unhearing ear that after all will never listen to the minstrelsy of heaven and the hosannas of redemption? Shall he call Lazarus from the grave and beat back corruption for a few years, and then that body go back into the grave forever?

These facts have a prophetic phase. They point from partial relief of human suffering to complete relief of human suffering. Precisely the same sign becomes the credential of Christ's apostles. "As ye go, heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out demons. They shall pick up serpents. They shall be exempt from the poison and shall be able to recover the sick."

The most striking object-lessons of Messianic and apostolic days, the scenes that leap to the eye, not summoned by artful contrivances, but that spontaneously put themselves upon the arena before the human sight when we think of Christ and when we think of his apostles, is that great crowd of sufferers, the halting lame man, the groping blind man, the straining deaf ear, listening for some sound of mercy; the shriveled arm, endeavoring to be whole again; the broken-hearted mothers, holding out babes flushed with fever; the friends climbing upon the roof and letting down through the tiles, laid aside, the paralyzed body. Oh! look at them! And in apostolic days see how they bring

their sick and helpless ones and lay them down, that even the shadow of Peter may fall upon them.

In Paul's day notice how they timidly touched his body with their handkerchiefs and carried them off to some helpless ones that could not come and could not be brought. Now, with all miraculous healings of both Testaments is another class of prophetic facts, that class which reconveys to bankrupted nature lost power. Behold Hannah, the childless woman, the reproach in Israel, unable to present as her successor any child. "Lord, have mercy on me."

Behold Abraham, his body as good as dead, and all hope of the world dependent on a successor to Abraham, and now comes by divine power, not by some skill of medicine, not by any inherent recuperative power in nature, but by the power of God, there comes ability, as if one had never had a bankruptcy of his natural powers. Still more striking are the recoveries from actual death. Let us look at them. A widow with an only son—how many here have just one?—and the bright little boy was out in the field one day following his father, and the sun was hot, and he had a sunstroke, and they brought him home and put him on his mother's lap, and he moaned and died. He was dead! Dead! It was not a case of suspended animation. He was dead. And after a long time God's prophet comes, not with healing medicaments, not with powerful restoratives, but in the name of God, and trusting

in the power of God. He prostrates himself on the body of the child and cries out into the world where the spirit has gone, "Come back, O spirit, and reanimate this body," and it came.

Again, Elisha died, the great prophet, and he was buried, and the enemy were hovering around the borders, and a man had died while they were watching for the force of the enemy, and they were trying to bury him in a hurry, and while they were picking up the body to carry him out someone cried, "To arms; they come! They come!" And they hastily gathered up the dead man and dropped him down in Elisha's tomb, and when his body strikes Elisha's body he wakes up and rises and comes out of that grave himself.

See the little girl, thirteen years old, dead, with the flush just fading, so lately has she died, and Jesus comes and puts his hand upon her head and says, "Little girl, I say unto thee, Get up." And she arose. He meets that funeral procession—Life meeting Death. He sees the widow, her son on the bier, and commands them to stand still, and puts his hand upon that body and says, "Young man, arise," and he gave him to his mother.

And when other mothers, with hearts as badly broken, in grief as deep and immeasurable as hers, shall come from the millions of graves where sleep their sons and daughters, and say: "O my Saviour, these bodies of the dead, shall they never be given back to us?"

And when he stands before the grave of Lazarus, where corruption is rioting, and the offense of corruption fills the air with its loathsome smell, Jesus in a voice of authority penetrates the charnel house, in a tone that pierces the dull cold ear of death, wakes up Lazarus and the shrouded dead comes forth. Look at these facts.

I will briefly mention three other facts, and they are far more significant than any which have been cited. I go back to the time when Enoch walked with God. There was that man, soul and body, here on earth, and Enoch came to where men usually found death, and Enoch was translated that he should not see death. Enoch's body went to heaven. And shall it remain alone in heaven forever? Shall the body of no other saint join Enoch's body?

Elijah, the great prophet, who once prayed to die, is now informed that he shall never die, and while walking in the field God summoned him. The flashing chariot of heaven came down for the honored guest, and by translation, by transfiguration, by instant elimination of all corruption and all mortality the body of Elijah goes to heaven. Shall those two alone be in heaven?

Here is another fact, the only fact in the world apart from the resurrection of the body of Jesus Christ that exactly fits the case. I quote from the gospel of Matthew at the death of Christ. "There was a great earthquake, and the rocks were rent, and graves were opened, and many of them that

had fallen asleep came out of the tombs, and after Christ's resurrection showed themselves, alive in the holy city, to die no more."

Now that is the prophecy of fact. O man, into whose heart the breath of doubt as cold as the wind from the icebergs of the North comes to chill every warm hope that has a promise of life, why should it be a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?

VII

A SERMON ON THE JUDGMENT

"Because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." —Acts 17: 31.

MY reason for preparing this particular series on "The Judgment," as following the sermons on "The Resurrection," grew out of the strong relation between the resurrection and the judgment. This relation consists of two parts: first, the relation between Christ's own resurrection and the judgment, and the relation between our resurrection and the judgment. The first relation is clearly set forth in both the scriptures read here this morning. (Acts 10: 40-42; Acts 17: 22-31.) The first one says, "God raised him from the dead and commanded us"—(We have no option. It is an imperious decree of the divine will.). He commanded us that "we should preach that this is he that shall judge the quick and the dead." And in this text it is stated that the assurance that God has given to all men that there will be a judgment, and that Jesus of Nazareth will be the Judge, is the fact of his resurrection from the dead. The word "assurance" here is literally "faith" in the original. He hath given faith to all men: that is

the ground of faith, the data, the basis upon which a rational faith can rest, in that he hath raised him from the dead. So far as the relation between our resurrection and the judgment is concerned, we may express it in this form: Our resurrection must precede the judgment—closely precede it. In every case where the general judgment of God is spoken of it is preceded by the general resurrection, the resurrection of the just and the resurrection of the unjust, and the cause of this precedent lies, doubtless, in this fact, that the judgment will be upon the entire man; not just a part of him, as the spirit, nor another part of him, as the body, but the entire man, body and spirit. And yet another cause lies in this, that until the resurrection of the dead, when we reach the end of the affairs of time, it is impossible for man to rightly comprehend the extent of his influence upon those that come after him, and we are responsible for our influence as well as for our deeds. One who poisons the minds of young people, or debauches their morals, or shakes their faith, or stands as an obstacle before Jesus Christ and keeps men from coming to God, does not find a termination of his evil in his own death. That influence goes on, as when a pebble is dropped in a lake the ever widening circles of waves never stop until they touch the remotest shore. Therefore, in order for the judgment to reach not only the whole man, but the whole effect, the moral effect, of the man's life, it is necessary

that it shall be deferred until the end of time and after the resurrection of the dead.

Now, as this is but the beginning of a series of sermons upon this subject, I wish, first of all, to inquire into the basis of the judgment. What are the foundations upon which it rests? These foundations are clearly set forth in the passage read from the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. First, God made the world. He made it and all things therein. It is his workmanship. He made men, all men. Not only is the judgment based first upon the fact of God's creative act, but also upon the fact of his providence. His providence controls the world now and has always controlled it; and not merely by a general providence, but by a personal, moral government he rules over the world. That moral reign of God extends throughout all ages and to all men. Not only this, but it is by his decree that our times are allotted to us and the boundaries of our habitation. And not only this, but in everything it is his decree that men should seek after him, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us. In his omnipresence he is accessible to all men. Now, this creative act of God, this general providence of God and his special providence, and this moral government of God, when followed by the special revelation of God, constitute the broad foundation upon which judgment rests. You can easily understand, therefore, the feelings that filled

the heart of the Apostle Paul when he passed through Athens. Oh, what a sad thing, that the city where intellectual development was the greatest, and physical training exhibited its most marvelous examples, and where the arts and sciences flourished to the greatest and highest degree—oh, how sad to think that this city was the most ignorant on the face of the earth! Ignorant! Ignorant! I do not mean ignorant in many things, but on the main thing. With all their books they were ignorant of that one Book whose first sentence would have flashed more light into their minds than all that had been ascertained by their wisest men, and that was, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." They did not know that they were ignorant of God's creation of the world. "It happened," said the Epicureans, and their evolution descendants now say, "It was the result of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. As God did not create the world, God cannot judge the world." You see how that follows. God does not control the world. "It is Fate," says the Stoic. Fate, and if Fate control there is no responsibility. Where there is no responsibility there can be no judgment. "Chance," said the Epicurean. "Fate," said the Stoic. Oh, the ignorance, the ignorance! Then they were ignorant of the revelation of God, that in his compassion he had revealed himself by inspiration of men, declaring his will. He had manifested himself in the flesh, in the person of his

own Son, to come and redeem from darkness and from death the men whom he had created. They did not know it. By their boasted wisdom they had not found God. And so when Paul stood there in the market-place at Athens and kept preaching Jesus and the Resurrection, Jesus and the Resurrection, they thought he was a babbler. You will see at once that unless the mind takes hold of the fact that God made the world and God governs the world by his providence, and God rules the world by his moral law, and God holds men responsible to that moral law, we cannot have an idea of the judgment.

Then again, a judgment coming from God must be a judgment in righteousness. The Judge of all the earth will do right. His justice will not discriminate. There will be no respect of persons with God. Those fictitious things that have much to do with turning justice aside in the tribunals of earth cannot possibly affect the final arbitraments of God. Everything will be taken into fair account. But in order for that judgment to be a judgment in righteousness, to be a judgment in such righteousness that the one who receives the heaviest punishment by way of penalty in the day of wrath may yet be compelled to testify to the righteousness of the verdict against him, it was imperative that the Judge himself should be one in some touch with the judged, and therefore in the revelation of God in the person of Jesus

Christ he became the Son of Man, and because he was the Son of Man God commits all judgment to him. There are many points upon which we cannot enter sympathetically into the joys and the labors and the destinies of angels. We are different in nature, and God in his pure spirit, invisible to us, unapproachable in his glory, would frighten us, would horrify us, would dazzle us, if we had to appear before him. But if one is constituted as the Judge, himself also a man, having entered into human life and passed through its experiences from the cradle to the grave, knowing its heat, its cold, its hunger, its poverty, its pain, then such an one, from his experience, having been tempted in all things as we are tempted, would be for men the fairest and the best judge that the world could have. Yet, again, though a man in one phase of his nature, if he be a misanthropical man, a Timon the man-hater; if he be not compassionate to human infirmities, if he do not love men, if he do not love men enough to die for men, we would have a Judge upon the throne whose cold heart, though the heart of a man, would chill us when we came to stand before him. But if that Judge is a man, and the man of all men the most loving, of all men the most patient, the most condescending, the most pitying, one who gave himself to die for men, no man can question the verdict that is rendered on the score of an unjust and unsympathetic Judge. But if a man is to be the Judge, there must be

some adequate assurance to us that he is so constituted, there must be some broad ground, some impregnable data, that will make the guaranty sufficient to us, that not someone else, but this very one, is constituted the judge of the world. And that was the assurance of the resurrection from the dead. When God raised him from the dead, after the claims that he had made, and when he had predicted those claims upon that resurrection, when he had put all of the claims upon the solitary test of the fact that God would raise him from the dead upon the third day, and that resurrection having taken place, there is ground, broad and adequate ground, for every man to believe that God has not only appointed a day in which he will judge the world, but that he has appointed a man to be the judge of the world. We, upon our part, can have no objection to the judge, and God, upon his part, can have no objection to the judge. The infinite love that he manifested toward us he also manifested toward the Father; in his divinity he touches the throne. In his humanity he touches the cradle and the grave; so that in every respect God has assured that this judgment that is to be held will be a righteous judgment. And no matter what you think about it now; no matter how much you may complain of God's government; one thing is certain, that when you hear the voice that pronounces the judgment, whether it be, "Come, ye blessed," or "Depart, ye cursed," there will rise to your lips

no protest. Your memory and your conscience will be eternal witnesses of the complete righteousness of every temporal judgment of God and of the righteousness of this final verdict which is passed upon all men. So that to any objector you may say this: "The Bible teaches that when the general judgment is held, no matter what the verdict on you is, you are assured that you will testify when it is given that it was righteous, that it was fair, that there can be no question of its reasonableness in every particular, and you will be the judge of that."

Now, having considered this basis of the judgment, we can understand how the apostolic heart was disturbed when he looked out upon that city which, with all of its culture, its refinement, its devotion to arts and science, was in ignorance of the great fact of the universe. And now we can see what a relation there is between such a sermon today and the meeting which is in progress in the University. "The times of this ignorance God overlooked, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Why? Why repent? "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." And that judgment certain, however remote; that judgment clearer than sunlight, however distant; that judgment in the text looms up before us as an eternal certainty, whose natural tendency is to awaken conviction in the hearts of

men, and to cause men to turn from their sins, to repent of their sins, to accept the salvation offered in Jesus Christ. And this motive is as high as heaven itself. You see at once how, when it is grasped by the mind and felt by the heart, that it operates in bringing about repentance. There is a God. He made me. He made the world. His moral government rules over me. I am responsible to him. I have sinned against him. I have gone astray, and there is a judgment day appointed, and when that day comes I must stand before the judgment seat of Christ to answer for the deeds that are done in the body, and the light of that day will unmask every hidden thing, and bring every secret thing into judgment. The light of that day will not merely touch my overt acts and bring them clearly outlined into view, as a range of mountains on a clear day, but it will shine into my very heart. It will look to the seat and origin and spring of action. It will discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. It will bring out my motives. It will show me as I really am in God's holy sight, and every word that fell from my lips in time, and every imagination that took wings, like a bird set free, and flew with wayward pinions into forbidden space, and every slimy thought that was allowed to crawl like a serpent of hell through the inner chambers of my soul; all of them will be brought out in the light of that day.

Oh, the scope of the final judgment of God, in

view of which and of that assurance of the resurrection of the dead, what ought I to do now? What action is becoming to one so situated, being possessed of a moral nature, a rational and accountable being, finding myself condemned under the righteous law of God, altogether helpless in myself to recover from my ruin, and the publication made to me that the Judge himself has come to redeem the world, and that by simple faith in him all of the black record of my wrong can be expunged from the books of the recording angel, and I can in a moment become whiter than snow? What a power, then, the judgment is, to bring about repentance? And instead of harsh censure, instead of bitter hostility to any form of speculative philosophy, that through chance or fate would retire God from the universe as its maker, and from its control as a ruler, oh, let there come into our hearts the most unspeakable compassion for such blindness, when we see them groping, groping. That is exactly the Greek idea of the expression, feeling after God. That we might feel after him and find him! And when we see them groping on the rugged edge of the pit, liable of themselves, even if none should give them a push, to fall any moment into perdition, oh, what should be the feeling of our hearts toward them, and how should we endeavor to lead them to repentance instead of ourselves passing judgment upon them now!

We must all stand before the judgment seat of

Christ. I have given you merely this introductory statement of the series of sermons to be preached upon this subject. You know—your conversation with men and your observation of men have taught you—that unless the judgment can come within the reach of man's vision, unless the sense of responsibility to moral government can enter into men's hearts, there will be no restraint of crime, and no deadlier poison could be concocted, nor could there be any more dangerous form in which it could be administered to human lips than for speculative philosophy to creep into the text-books of schools and weaken men's convictions in the fact that God made the world, God rules the world and men are morally responsible to God, and men must answer to God in the general judgment for all the deeds that are done in the body.

I close this introductory statement with a single idea, but though solitary it is huge, far-reaching, suggestive. It lies under that department of the subject called the scope of the judgment. Will God bring me into judgment for anything that my spirit does after my body dies? No; then as sure as there can be on this earth any logic, there can be no probation after death. God himself counts the books closed, the case made up, not another entry to be made upon its pages, when a man dies, when his body dies. And hell never generated a more dangerous fallacy than the delusion that somehow, in some way, in the other world there may

be a gospel of mercy preached, there may be a mercy preached, there may be a means of recovery, there may be a new probation. Though Adam's spirit has been with God since Adam died, not one thought of that spirit, not one deed that that spirit has done since Adam's body died will be taken account of in the judgment. In other words, so far as the judgment is concerned, character, if not sooner, does certainly crystallize at death. It is no more malleable, it is no more fusible, it is no more ductile, it is fixed and fixed forever. If a man dies unjust, he is raised unjust. If a man dies vile, he is raised vile. The judgment shall make no inquisition into the grave, there will be no search or investigation except what you did, what you said, what you thought, what you felt, here, now, in time. See what a bearing that has on repentance. If death may come to me any hour; if death comes to somebody every hour; if every time we draw a breath some soul has laid down its body and departed out of the region of probation, and has gone into that fixedness of character in which it shall stand at the judgment; and if you and I in a few hours may be in that condition; oh, how timely that God now commandeth men everywhere to repent. All men! It makes it a matter not merely of eternal moment but of immediate concern. It presses for instant consideration. It admits of no delay. The thief of the world, deeper-branded as a thief than any of them is the thief that keeps stealing the

precious moments in which alone we can prepare to meet God, and while stealing, whispers, "Time enough! Time enough! Time enough!" It may be your brother. It may be your daughter, that bright-eyed girl, O mother! that is the apple of your eye. I tell you that if she were to die to-night, and die unprepared to meet God, not all your tears, not all your prayers, not all that your friends can bring to bear, not all that time can muster and eternity can congregate will give one spark of hope for the salvation of that child. Not a spark!

"Then repent, the voice celestial cries,
No longer dare delay."

Do not dare to shove aside this chief, momentous question, "How shall I be judged before God?" Inasmuch as I am not judged now and cannot be, and inasmuch as I must stand before the white throne of the final judgment of my Lord, oh, what reasonable hope have I that in that judgment day I shall be acquitted and not condemned?

VIII

THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT OF GOD

"The day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God."—Rom. 2:5.

WHEN God created the world, with all of its creatures, under natural and spiritual laws according to their being, he did not turn it loose to work out its own destiny under these laws. It is true that in accommodation to man's understanding it is said that after creation had been performed, God rested from all of the works that he had made; but our Lord interprets that declaration when he says: "My Father worketh until now": that is, the work of God did not stop with the creation. No law ever enforces itself, either in the natural or in the spiritual world, nor indeed, in the government of men, any more than a train, well equipped, would automatically run itself without a brakeman, without an engineer, without a conductor, without a fireman. There has been no vacation of the throne of God from the beginning. His superintendence in both the natural and spiritual worlds, and particularly his moral government over accountable, rational beings, have never relaxed for one moment, and this superintendence and rule have been not only general as

to systems and great things, but they have condescended to the most minute particulars. While he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, he also numbereth the very hairs of our head, and suffereth not even a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission.

Of course, under a superintendence, under a rule, so general, so special, so persistent, there have been numberless special judgments. Some of these special judgments have been and are astounding and repulsive to the unrenewed mind of man. In getting at the philosophy and the necessity of the general judgment, I wish to examine some of these special judgments that have taken place in time against which man has revolted.

First, the judgment upon the apostate angels. The angels which "kept not their first estate" and sinned, he judged and cast out of heaven, but did not send them to their final abode; cast them down to the earth, where they come in contact with the human race to malign and injure it. Now, the mind of man has not revolted at the fact that God judged the apostate angels, but that he did not send them to their final abode and in their final fixed condition. He permitted them to stop in this world and tempt and torture the children of men. That part of the divine judgment man has criticised. He is unable to understand it. Even the most enlightened Christian does not yet fully comprehend all of the reasons which actuated the divine

mind in permitting the human race to be subjected to the seductive influences of the devil and his demons. They are reserved to the general judgment.

Another one of the astounding special judgments was the judgment of God upon the first Adam in the garden of paradise, set forth in the early chapters of Genesis. Man has not objected so much to the expulsion of these delinquents from the garden of paradise, nor to any infliction put upon them, but when "In Adam all died," when by the decree of God death through Adam passed upon all men, and when, as a result, all of the posterity of Adam became depraved, inherited a hereditary bias against good and in favor of evil, man objected to that part of the judgment in the Garden of Eden. To the unrenewed mind it has been an intensely revolting decree of God. In every possible way men have fought against that decision. They have denied the facts. They have denied the conclusions. They have assailed the equity. In every way that special judgment of God has been rejected by the unrenewed mind. And what Christian in his most enlightened state has ever been able fully to understand all the wisdom and righteousness of that judgment of God?

Then again on one occasion, God judged the whole human race by sending the Deluge, only one family escaping from the universal ruin. Men looking at that specific act of the moral government

of God have objected to it. They have denied the fact. They have denied the conclusions. They have denied the equity.

Yet, again, when as a forecast of another deluge, not of water, but of fire, God sent swift and irretrievable destruction upon the cities of the plain, swallowing up Sodom and Gomorrah in the vengeance of eternal fire, men have objected. They are willing enough to concede that sometimes a volcanic eruption, like that of Vesuvius, or an earthquake, like that at Lisbon or Caracas, or a sea-storm, like that which swept away Galveston, or a tornado on the land, like that which desolated Cisco, they are willing enough to concede that these things occur in nature, but they deny that God, as ruler, specially intervened in the swallowing up of the cities of the plain by earthquake and fire. And it is exceedingly difficult for one even of the brightest faith and of the clearest and broadest general information to comprehend all the reasons involved in God's using natural forces to bring about a swift and awful judgment upon a city.

In like manner, while they have been willing to concede that cities and states have natural laws of growth and of attaining to their maximum, and then decaying and perishing, they have objected to the special judgments of God upon Tyre, upon Nineveh, upon Babylon and particularly that most awful destruction upon Jerusalem announced by our Lord himself: a judgment that came directly

from God, a judgment that came on account of the sin of the cities judged, or of the nations; and however much natural or human instrumentalities were employed, the immediate concern of the Almighty in it, it is that that they have revolted against.

Still more have men revolted at a correlated series of judgments that have covered almost the whole historic period of the human race, consisting of five parts: First, the giving up of the Gentiles to the vile affections, giving them up to the lusts of the flesh, giving them up to work that which is unseemly, until every practical phase of wickedness was developed in them. Second, the judgment which selected one nation and made that nation the peculiar people of God, showering upon it blessings untold for many ages. Then, third, the rejection and dispersion of that select people, accompanied with a judicial blindness which exists to the present day, so that throughout the world the Jews, that once favored people of God, with whom were the urim of the priest and the thummin of the prophet, the Jews, who were God's mouthpieces, are now blind, a veil over their eyes; and in all of their dispersion subjected to pitiless persecution; and then, fourth, the calling of the Gentiles; the door closed so long flung wide open; a judgment that not merely takes away the kingdom of God from the Jews but confers it upon another people and the 1,800 or 1,900 years in which the Gentiles

have been the special favorites of God,—for how much longer we do not know,—followed by another judgment, as yet prophetic, when rejected Israel shall be recalled and restored. Now, upon every part of these correlated judgments, this system of judgments, man has raised a protest and stood in rebellious attitude. And Christians find themselves put to it, more perhaps than they are willing to admit, to explain in a thoroughly satisfactory manner these several and correlated judgments of God.

But I come to one that beside all the others is as Mont Blanc to a mole-hill. Not the sentence on angels fallen, not the verdict on Adam and Eve, not the judgment of the Deluge and not the penalty on Sodom and Gomorrah, not the giving up of the Gentiles, the calling of the Jews, the opening of the door to the Gentiles, the rejection of the Jews, and the restoration of the Jews, all put together, equal the astonishment of man at another special judgment of God to which I wish now to call attention. It was when God Almighty, God the Father, judged to both physical and spiritual death his only begotten Son. I refer not to any judgment rendered by Pilate or the Sanhedrin and executed by Roman soldiers, but I refer to the fact that the Father was pleased to bruise him, that the Father awakened the sword of divine wrath against that gentle Shepherd, that the Father stripped him of human sympathy and abandoned him in the hour of darkness. It is that verdict on the second Adam, as a sub-

stitute for sinners, to make vicarious expiation for sin, that is more repugnant to the unrenewed mind than all the others put together. Their gorge rises at it. It provokes their sneers and their gibes. They question it upon every part of the ground. They deny the fact. They deny the reasons. They deny the conclusions. And with bitterness and malignity they fight it, and have fought it from its first announcement. Christians in endeavoring to explain this special judgment of God have written many, and some of them good, bodies of systematic theology. They have endeavored to fathom the motives and reasons of the divine heart, and through the revelation of God they have been able to flash much light upon the subject, but this is like that system of correlated judgments. Only the most spirit-enlightened mind can say: "Oh! the depth both of the riches and of the wisdom of God. His judgments are past finding out." And I venture to say that when we come to the general judgment, all of our bodies of systematic divinity, with their explanations, will fall inconceivably short of the fullness of the reasons and the fullness of the wisdom of the divine judgment upon Jesus of Nazareth, Son of Man and Son of God.

Finally, the judgments that have come upon men as individuals, on two points. As men report it, no two men have the same circumstances, the things that stand around them are not the same; the light, the privilege, the opportunity, of no two is exactly

even. And yet all of one class of men, as they say, are sent to a fixed and equal heaven, and all of another class of men, no two alike, either in opportunity or in degree of guilt, are sent to one fixed and equal hell. The other point in the special judgments upon individuals that has awakened the opposition of man has been this: That here in time he is either justified or condemned, and as a result of that justification or condemnation, immediately upon the death of the body the soul goes to its reward or to its punishment, and yet at some remote date in the future, after ages of joy in reward, and ages of suffering of penalty, these souls are dragged from heaven and hell to a common tribunal, to be tried. Does reward, does penalty precede trial and sentence?

I have cited these particular judgments of God, that have occurred in time, based upon the fact that he has never vacated the throne, and that he did not create the world and turn it loose to work out its own destiny, and that there is no such thing as a law enforcing itself, and that he has all the time been governing and ruling and judging. Now the difficulties which have been suggested by these special judgments lead us to consider the philosophy and the necessity of the general judgment, and hence our text: "The day of the revelation of the judgment of God," the main thought being this: That while that day is called the judgment day, it is not called judgment day so much from the fact

that it is to be a day of ascertainment of man's moral attitude, certainly not of ascertainment to God, but it is to be a day that reveals the wisdom and righteousness and equity of every past judgment of God,—reveals it not to God, but reveals it to the judged; the judged that could not understand it thoroughly in time, even the best informed, and hence could not glorify God as he deserved, since their glorification, to be intelligent, must be based upon knowledge, and men in turn are ignorant. You can understand somewhat the reasons of your acquittal here and now. On the day that you accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Saviour, God justifies you and he assures you that you shall never come into condemnation. You can see some of the philosophy of it, not all the philosophy of it. The most grateful heart that ever throbbed in the bosom of a saved man cannot intelligently adore and glorify God for his grace in salvation now as he will do it when he shall know even as he is known. "The day of the revelation of the judgment of God," the day that will show to the saved Christian all of the reasons of his salvation, all of the wisdom and appropriateness of that divine plan of redemption, all the extent of that redemption, both as to soul and body, you need that day. Hosannas languish on your lips, even in revival times. Your spirit of praise is oftentimes the spirit of heaviness. You go around rejoicing somewhat, but O thou saved soul, when

that day for which all other days were made shall come, and the height and depth and length and breadth of the love of God in your salvation shall appear, not painfully, not gradually, but in one instantaneous flash of information, your joy eclipses conception then. A man is condemned now. He stands condemned. The verdict has already been rendered and it stays a verdict so long as he rejects God's plan of salvation. "He that believeth not is condemned already." But there are many things about it that he does not comprehend, and there are many things about his condemnation that stagger you, the Christian. Not long ago a young preacher came to me. He said: "The eternity of this penalty, it staggers me, it staggers me. My sentiment revolts at it. I cannot conceive how I would eternally condemn my child for any offense." Is there any reason for that day, so as to cause each condemned soul to thoroughly comprehend the reason of that unalterable sentence, "Depart from me," and the eternity of that penalty, "into everlasting fire"!

God declares that when the light comes every knee will be bowed and every tongue will confess, and every heart will acquiesce in the righteousness of the verdict rendered. But I am not speaking so much just now of the condemned man's understanding it as of the Christian man's understanding that condemnation. He will say, "One of these condemned is perhaps my father, may be my mother,

my brother, may be my sister, my child." I know that you cannot take in now, constituted as you are, with the flesh and its natural ties, and the ties of blood binding you, you cannot to your satisfaction acquiesce in the eternity of the judgment and of the penalty of the law. We need that day, "the day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God," when every secret thing is uncovered, when every false face is unmasked, when flesh and blood have been left behind, when body has been sublimated and spirit glorified, and all of the dignity and majesty of law is brought out in full view, and government in its foundation and superstructure is comprehended, when we ourselves are detached from earthly ties and united to God, we will be able to understand and to acquiesce in any penalty God may inflict upon any person. Heaven will not be unhappy over the eternal punishment of the lost, but you would be unhappy, situated as you now are, and with the little you know, if God were to uncap the pit before your eyes.

The philosophy and the necessity of the general judgment seem to me clear from the consideration of the special judgments. It is bound to be future, because influence has not yet struck the shores of eternity. It is bound to be future because all of the man has not yet received either reward or penalty. It is bound to be final, for it takes place at the end, not only of the probation of one man and his complete probation in every transition, but

at the end of the earth's probation. There will never be a reason for recalling the case and re-opening the question. On the throne, the great white throne, are many books of explanation, and these books will be opened and they will shine in their record upon what a man has thought, what he has imagined and what he has done; but there is one book there, not a sentence in it written that day. Before the judgment is set, the last record in it has been made. Hence, it is a book of judicial decisions already rendered, and that is the Book of Life. And it comes to pass that whoso is not found already written in that book, not to be written that day, as a result of the investigation,—but whosoever is not found written in that book is cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. In this way we can comprehend something of the nature of the general judgment. And yet there are real trials and judgments that day, and I want in subsequent sermons to show you the Christian at the judgment seat of Christ. There are some that deny that he stands there. I want to prove to you that he must stand there. True, he is not on trial for his life. That book of judicial decisions already rendered establishes that. But he is there to be investigated, and there is something that will be adjudged as the result of the investigation of the Christian. And then I want to show you, in subsequent sermons, what, after all, is the sole ground of the general judgment. It is not worth while

to multiply causes. A single thought expresses the whole thing. The ministering angels that stand around the throne of God will be affected in all their future by the bearing of that thought. The angels which lost their first estate and received the verdict for that, but have been permitted under limitations to seduce the human race, shall come before that judgment, on that point. On that point Christians come before it. On that point sinners come before it. And as the last declaration of this sermon I avow that the treatment accorded to Jesus Christ in his gospel and in his people is the sole ground of the general judgment for angel or man. Let us unite in prayer.

IX

THE CHRISTIAN AT THE JUDGMENT

"So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."—Rom. 14:12; 2 Cor. 5:10.

IN the first sermon of this series we have found the Scriptures teaching a future, final and general judgment of men and angels. The second sermon was devoted to the consideration of the nature, philosophy and necessity of this future, final and general judgment. The theme of the present sermon—third of the series—is

THE CHRISTIAN AT THE JUDGMENT.

The design of the discussion is twofold:

First, to establish the FACT that the Christian as well as the sinner must appear before that final tribunal; and second, to show WHY he must so appear. For order and clearness the matter will be set forth under several distinct heads or propositions.

PROP. I.—*The Christian must stand before the judgment bar.*

Here at the outset we are confronted with the contention by some that the Christian is exempt from this judgment. This contention is plausibly based upon these or kindred passages of Scripture:

"He that believeth on him is not judged." (John 3:18.)

"He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." (John 5:24.)

"And by him everyone that believeth is justified from all things." (Acts 13:39.)

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. 8:1.)

But if these and kindred passages mean all that the contention based on them claims, they prove too much, for by them it may be shown that the sinner is exempt from the final judgment.

For example, let us complete the declaration of which the first passage quoted is only a part: "He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not is judged already." (John 3:18.)

By the judgment here spoken of one class is already acquitted—the other already condemned. If, therefore, this judgment exempts the acquitted from appearance at the final judgment it must also exempt the condemned, and this would be to leave the final judgment without anybody to come before it except angels.

For this cause the second sermon of this series considered the philosophy, necessity and nature of the final judgment as a day of the revelation of the past judgments of God.

In that last day it is just as necessary to make manifest the past justification of the righteous as to make manifest the past condemnation of the

wicked. This is one reason why both saint and sinner must appear at the judgment. Neither one in time, either before or after death, has fully comprehended all the wisdom and righteousness of these past verdicts. That day will make evident to all intelligences the dignity, majesty and holiness of law and the justice of the divine administration. But this by no means answers all the ends of the general judgment. Certain other scriptures make it evident that the Christian must appear before the judgment seat of Christ for actual judgment. To the Christians at Rome Paul wrote: "But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess to God. So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. 14: 10-12.) To the church at Corinth he also wrote: "Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him. For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (Cor. 5: 9, 10.)

And our Lord himself said: "The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things; and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth evil things. And I say unto you that for every

idle word that man shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." (Matt. 12:35, 36.)

Yet again he says: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he render to every man according to his deeds." (Matt. 16:27.)

If one should be so foolish as to claim that our Lord here speaks only of the wicked when he says "every man," how can he escape from the later declaration of our Saviour recorded in Matt. 25:31-35? There unmistakably the Christian appears and is made to understand that his deeds come into account and the treatment he accorded to Christ, in his cause and in his people, receives a just though unexpected recompense of reward.

To the same effect writes the brother of our Lord: "Murmur not, brethren, one against another, that ye be not judged; behold the judge standeth before the door." (James 5:9.)

These scriptures establish the first proposition. The Christian must stand before the judgment.

As leading up to the next proposition we may revert to an objection against the final judgment urged by unrenewed men and cited in the second sermon, namely:

"All the saved, no two alike in environment, hereditary bias, natural abilities, gifts of grace, op-

portunities, or degrees of righteousness, are received alike into a fixed and equal heaven."

It is perhaps needless to say that this objection is a monstrous perversion of Scripture teaching. Neither heaven nor hell is without degrees. But as equality of conditions is conceded in one particular of the final award—whether in heaven or hell—let our next proposition cover this point.

PROP. 2.—*Salvation is equal at the judgment because its conditions were equal.*

Every Christian will be completely justified—completely sanctified in spirit—and completely glorified in body. There is no inequality of condition here. This follows because all of them are saved by grace, through faith and not of works. If any part of this salvation were awarded as a debt due to man's performances, then would we rightly expect salvation to be a variable quantity according to man's variable work. But the apostles are no more saved than the pastors, and the pastors no more saved than the deacons, and the deacons no more saved than the private members. All are justified, all sanctified, all glorified. There is on none of them wrinkle, spot, blemish or any such thing. And that day will make manifest the righteousness of Paul's declaration: "There is no difference." (Rom. 3:22.)

Men in constructing ladders up which to climb to heaven, and even Titans, who for such object pile mountains on mountains, will find that there is

no difference in value in their ladders of various lengths, since all are too short to span the chasm. One is as good as the other, since all are worthless.

God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him shall not perish, but have eternal life. It is of faith that it may be of grace and that promise may be sure to all the seed. In all this God's ways are equal. And the light of that last day will bring home to every conscience that in this award the judge of all the earth doeth right.

PROP. 3.—*Rewards at the judgment will be unequal because Christian fidelity will be found unequal.*

Surely on this account there will be degrees in heaven. And particularly at this point the Christian will come into actual judgment that day and not merely to a revelation of past judgment as in the matter of salvation. So justification unto life and condemnation unto death, that day will be a revelation and vindication of past judgments. But with reference to rewards in life or degrees in punishment it will be a day of actual judgment.

Some of the scriptures already cited establish this. To them many others may be added. As bearing directly upon this point we cite:

The Parables of the Talents and of the Pounds. (Matt. 25: 14-30; Luke 19: 12-37.) "Now after a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and maketh a reckoning with them."

"And it came to pass when he was come back again, having received the kingdom, that he commanded these servants, unto whom he had given the money, to be called unto him, that he might know what they had gained by trading." Both parables teach that our Lord himself is judge. That his second advent is the time of judgment. That each one will be held to a strict account of his stewardship. That he will reward each steward according to his fidelity. That as there will be varying degrees of fidelity so there will be varying degrees of reward. In respect to these rewards heaven will not be a fixed and equal quantity to all the saved. The inequality of the fidelity accounts for the inequality of the rewards. In all this, as in the matter of salvation, God's ways are equal.

In line with the unmistakable teaching of these parables is Paul's doctrine of ministerial accountability:

"For we (preachers) are God's fellow-workers. Ye (converts) are God's husbandry, God's building. According to the grace of God which was given unto me, as a wise master builder, I laid a foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall disclose it, because it

is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide, which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire." (1 Cor. 3:9-15.)

It would seem to be impossible to misunderstand this scripture. The command, "Take heed," is a distinct warning of future accountability. A preacher may not lightly put into God's building unconverted material, for God himself will inspect each building. Referring to this very building, the prophet Isaiah said: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, of sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste.

"Judgment also will I lay to the line and righteousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding-place.

"And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.

"From the time that it goeth forth it shall take you: for morning by morning shall it pass over, by day and by night, and it shall be a vexation only to understand the report.

"For the bed is shorter than that a man can

stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it."

To the same effect is the word of the Lord by another prophet. "Because, even because they have seduced my people, saying, Peace; and there was no peace; and one built up a wall, and, lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar: Say unto them which daub it with untempered mortar, that it shall fall: there shall be an overflowing shower; and ye, O great hailstones, shall fall; and a stormy wind shall rend it.

"Lo, when the wall is fallen, shall it not be said unto you, Where is the daubing wherewith ye have daubed it?

"Therefore thus saith the Lord God: I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury; and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in my fury to consume it.

"So I will break down the wall that ye have daubed with untempered mortar, and bring it down to the ground, so that the foundation thereof shall be discovered, and it shall fall and ye shall be consumed in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I am the Lord." (Ezekiel 13: 10-14.)

Brethren of the ministry, and there are many of you before me, let us not think we may avoid the final judgment of God. We must answer to him that day for all our work. The fire of Paul, the overflowing scourge of Isaiah, the storm of Ezekiel signify in strong and terrible figures some real

ordeal through which at the judgment we and our work must pass. The loss we suffer by the rejection and destruction of our unfaithful work is a real and dreadful loss. If we be on the foundation ourselves we will be saved for Christ's sake, though unrewarded for our work's sake. If not on the foundation we must perish with the downfall of our faulty building.

What is true of preachers is true of all their flock—each one for himself must give account unto God. To the same effect is the teaching of all those scriptures concerning the crowns bestowed upon the people of the Lord: The crown of life, the crown of righteousness, the crown of joy, the crown of glory. Justification based on Christ, imputed righteousness, received by faith, is a judicial decision of time—and is equal in all the saved.

But the bestowal of crowns is a reward for personal service and takes place at the final judgment —all at one time. Not even Paul is crowned yet. The crowning is not only at the end of time but is in the presence of all the intelligences of the universe. The distinction in the crowns displays in a remarkable way the inequality of the fidelity of the saints. But hear the Scriptures themselves on these crowns:

"Know ye not that they that run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? Even so run that ye may attain. And every man that striveth in the games exerciseth self-control in all things. Now

they do it to receive a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, as not uncertainly; so fight I, as not beating the air; but I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: Lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected." (1 Cor. 9:24-27.)

The fear of rejection in this case is not an apprehension of being finally lost, but of not winning the reward which is the prize of the race. In like manner Paul writes his farewell words:

"For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:6-8.)

The righteousness of this text is not the imputed righteousness of Christ which Paul had already received and by which he was justified, but is his personal righteousness, or right-doing, for which a crown of reward is offered—not yet received by him, but laid up for him and to be bestowed at the coming of his Lord.

In the same direction he earlier wrote: "For what is our hope or joy, or crown of glorying? Are not even ye before our Lord Jesus at his coming? For ye are our glory and our joy." (1 Thess. 2:19, 20.)

This is similar to the reward of David's faithful sower: "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing seed for sowing, shall doubtless come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him." (Psa. 126: 5, 6.)

So Peter encourages pastors to be faithful by holding out a hope of future reward: "And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Pet. 5:4.)

James also aligns himself with this teaching, inciting Christians to faithful endurance of trials, by hope of a future crown: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he hath been approved he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord promised to them that love him." (James 1:12.)

John, too, puts on record the words of our Lord himself, encouraging fidelity in the churches: "Fear not the things which thou art about to suffer; behold, the devil is about to cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days. Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life." (Rev. 2: 10.)

Here is a distinction between "life" and the "crown of life." "Life" comes in time and by grace, through faith. The "crown of life" is a reward of fidelity bestowed at the judgment.

Oh, the crowns of the judgment—the crowns of the judgment—how bright and alluring are they!

But stars do not differ more in luster than the crowns bestowed on the righteous. Well saith the prophet: "And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." (Dan. 12:3.)

Oh, be not deceived! There is inequality in heaven. God is just. All our instinctive judgments call for diversity of reward proportioned to fidelity in the service of our Lord.

What think you, brethren? Compare the fidelity of two women in the same church: One with sweetest meekness and self-denial honors her Lord in all things. When the world and society offer her their carnal pleasures, games, amusements and absorbing round of exacting requirements, her questions are: What would my Lord have me to do? Will these develop my spiritual nature? Will they be friends or foes to grace? Will they increase my Christian influence? Will they tend to lead my children towards God or away from God? She does not ask, What harm is in them, but what good? And so living in all things unto her Lord, ornamenting her life with good works, she finishes her course with joy, dying also unto the Lord, so that children and grandchildren arise and call her blessed.

Another indeed accepts the Lord as her Saviour, but lives ever with divided heart and service. The

claims of the world, of society, are acknowledged more than the claims of Christ's cause. She follows Jesus afar off. Her heart is cold. She is a stranger to the services of the Lord's house. She cannot be counted on for regular Christian work. Her position, her social influence, her habits, are all quoted against religion rather than for it. Sinners through her are not convicted of sin and led to repentance. She worships much at the shrines of pleasure, of society, and but little and seldom at the altars of God. In times of death or other great bereavement she indeed remembers God—but her life, with its trend, has been after all but a shabby, ragged and miserable service of God. And so she passes away to the great judgment throne. Our question recurs with emphasis: What think you? Shall these two women find heaven equal?

True, we rejoice if a long-expected ship enters the harbor. But there are different entrances. One barely enters, towed in by tugs of grace, almost a wreck, shrouds torn, masts fallen, cargo lost. The other has abundant entrance, every mast standing, every sail full and cargoed to the water's edge.

Is not this the lesson of Peter when he exhorts to that heavenly addition? I will not here quote his burning words, but go home and read them with earnest prayer for their profitable application to your souls: 2 Pet. 1:1-11. So far we have

found two reasons why the Christian must appear before the judgment seat of Christ: (a) That his justification in time by grace, without works, may be manifested and vindicated. (b) That he may be actually judged and rewarded as a steward of his Lord's grace.

We come now to consider other reasons to which but little attention is generally given. And yet are they very important. I never myself heard a sermon on them. Do therefore give your undivided attention to them now.

PROP. 4.—*After being judged himself the Christian will sit on Christ's throne and with him judge the unsaved world.*

John Bunyan, in "The Pilgrim's Progress," well says: "When he shall come with sound of trumpet in the clouds, as upon the wings of the wind; you shall come with him; when he shall sit upon the throne of judgment, you shall sit by him; yea, and when he shall pass sentence upon the workers of iniquity, let them be angels or men, YOU SHALL HAVE A VOICE IN THAT JUDGMENT, because they were his and your enemies."

For brevity sake, I cannot undertake to quote all the scriptures bearing upon this grave matter, but do cite enough to put the fact beyond question: "He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne."

(Rev. 3:21.) "And he that overcometh, and he that keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give authority over the nations. And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers; as I also have received of my Father." (Rev. 2:26, 27.) "Dare any of you, having a matter against his neighbor, go to law before the unrighteous, and not before the saints? Or know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world is judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge in the smallest matters?" (1 Cor. 6:12.) "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it." (Matt. 12:41, first clause, and 12:42, first clause.) "And Jesus said unto them, Verily, I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matt. 19:28.) "But ye are they that have continued with me in my temptation; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke 22:28-30.) "And to these also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his holy ones, to execute judgment

upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.)

On these startling scriptures but little needs to be said now by way of comment. They speak for themselves. Yet we may profitably note some things: To sit on the throne of judgment with Christ is not an empty form. It means our identification with him in all his honors. It implies an exercise of the functions of the throne both as to rule and judgment. It means that Christians actually pass judgment upon the ungodly. The tyrants who condemned the martyrs in time must receive sentence from the martyrs in glory. Festus, Felix, Agrippa and Cæsar then stand before the judgment seat of Paul. Herod must answer to John the Baptist. The earthly judges who condemned Obadiah Holmes and Lunsford and other Baptists to whipping or imprisonment in time, must be arraigned before their victims in eternity.

Before your bar, brethren, the infidels and atheists and materialists who now laugh you to scorn must stand and receive their final sentence from your lips. Impenitent scribes and Pharisees must answer to the apostles whom they persecuted. What a time it will be when the bloody Sanhedrin must be judged by Stephen, whom they unrighteously stoned! But particularly would I have you note the honor which God puts on the judgment

of his people when compared with the judgments of human law courts. How intense is the condemnation put upon the church member here who despises the verdict of his brethren and drags them before the courts of law, thereby putting shame upon Christ's cause before unbelievers! "I say this to move you to shame. What, cannot there be found among you one wise man who shall be able to decide between his brethren, but brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers? Nay, it is altogether a defect in you that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take wrong? Why not rather be defrauded?" (1 Cor. 6:5-7.)

Ought not Paul's words to be written in letters of fire upon the memory of him who despises the repeated verdict of his brethren and "dares to go to law before the unrighteous"?

PROP. 5.—*After being judged himself the Christian shall judge angels.*

One scripture will suffice for this point: "Know ye not that ye shall judge angels? How much more things that pertain to this life?" (1 Cor. 6:3.)

Here we do well to note the inferiority of angels to men. In his first estate indeed man was made a little lower than the angels, but in his last estate he is destined to be above all angels, principalities, powers. Angels are the servants of men. Doubtless it was on this very point Satan's pride revolted and he fell from his own first estate. This accounts

for his malignity towards the human race, not only because they were designed to be exalted above him, but because in a sense they were the provocation of his pride and the occasion of his downfall. And is not this the sinner's greatest degradation that he has become the slave of his servant? If it would be an unspeakable humiliation to an old-time Southern planter to become the slave of his own bondman, how infinitely humiliating must it be to be the sinner, made in God's image, to be sent to the slave-quarters of hell and there in the place prepared for his felon slaves call the devil master forever!

But to return to our subject:

Quite naturally servants are responsible to those whom they serve. And as angels were appointed to be ministering spirits to them that are the heirs of salvation, we may understand the philosophy of the Scriptures: Know ye not that ye shall judge angels?

And is it unreasonable to think that the holy angels who serve this probation well, shall at the last judgment be confirmed in their steadfastness against even the possibility of future apostasy? Men on the throne can utter the verdict: These have been faithful in all things. They have encamped about us. They have hovered over our assemblies. They have smitten our enemies. They have been diligent students of God's manifold wisdom as it was unfolded by the church on earth.

They strengthened us in weakness; held up our heads in sorrow and met us at the depot of death with the chariots of the sky and borne us away into Paradise.

But certainly there is poetic justice in man's judgment of the fallen angels. Then Christians will see Apollyon cower before him. And who would miss it when Eve and Job and Peter sit in judgment on Satan! How he did beguile the woman with his subtle craft! How he did hate Job without a cause and afflict him! How he did sift and triumph over poor, impulsive Peter!

Ah, well, it is their turn now. Everything comes to him who waits, and though the mill of God grinds slowly it grinds exceeding fine. For all these reasons, brethren, Christians must appear in the judgment.

X

THE SINNER AT THE JUDGMENT

"And if the righteous is scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"—1 Pet. 4:18.

WE are come to the last sermon of this series. In the first sermon we found the Scriptures teaching a future, final and general judgment of men and angels. In the second sermon were considered the philosophy and necessity of this judgment as a revelation and vindication of the divine administration. In the third sermon the fact of the Christian's appearance at this judgment was established and the reasons of his appearance there set forth in order.

Our present theme is:

THE SINNER AT THE FINAL JUDGMENT.

As in the third sermon, so now, the matter for consideration will be submitted under several distinct heads or propositions:

PROP. 1.—*Due notice of this judgment has been served on all sinners.*

(1) This judgment has been revealed in the book of nature—open to all men—"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hinder the truth in unrighteousness: Because that which

is known of God is manifest in them. For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity: that they may be without excuse." (Rom. 1: 18-20.)

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge: There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." (Psa. 19: 1-4.)

"God in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways. And yet he left not himself without witness, in that he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness." (Acts 14: 16, 17.)

It was the divine purpose that the light of nature should lead to nature's God: "The God that made the world and all things therein, he being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he served by men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and he made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; THAT THEY SHOULD SEEK GOD, if haply

they might feel after him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being." (Acts 17:24-28.)

Concerning this light the apostle adds: "Because that, knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks: but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

"Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonored among themselves; for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen, For this cause God gave them up to vile passions." (Rom. 1:21-26.)

"And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting: being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, whisperers, back-biters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affec-

tion, unmerciful, who, knowing the ordinances of God, that they that practice such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consent with them that practice them." (Rom. 1:28-32.)

"Wherefore thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest dost practice the same things. And we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against them that practice such things. And reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practice such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his works." (Rom. 2:1-6.)

(2) The responsibility disclosed in external nature is also written within on men's hearts. "For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them." (Rom. 2:14, 15.)

(3) Man's establishment of civil government shows that he acknowledges that the notice of God's judgment has been received and understood. He has rightly interpreted the law of responsibility written without and within himself. He is duly sensible of right and wrong, and knows well that there must be a lawgiver whose law prescribes the right and prescribes the wrong. He has never hesitated to hold other men responsible for wrong-doing towards himself.

(4) Responsibility to divine government has been revealed in all the providence of God. And throughout all human history it is evident that man has attributed the prosperity or adversity dispensed to individuals and nations as a token of either divine favor or disfavor. But clearer than the external light of nature, or the internal light of conscience, or the teachings of Providence, is—

(5) The revelation of judgment in the Bible. The heart and conscience of man readily bow to the rightfulness of these announcements of the Holy Book: "Marvel not at this; for the hour cometh in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." (John 5: 28, 29.)

"The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent; inasmuch as he hath

appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts 17: 30, 31.)

"At the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, God will recompense vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: Who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (2 Thess. 1: 7-9.)

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, and books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the book, according to their works." (Rev. 21: 11, 12.)

Thus external nature, conscience, providence and revelation have served due notice of the final judgment on all men, and their holding others responsible for wrongdoing in civil government is an acknowledgment of the service.

PROP. 2.—*The sinner stands often in anticipation before the final judgment, both before and after death.*

(1) *Many times before death.*

This anticipation is sometimes in dreams. In "The Pilgrim's Progress" the Christian is led to a room where a man rising from bed and trembling in affright thus explains his terror:

"This night, as I was in my sleep, I dreamed, and behold, the heavens grew exceeding black; also it thundered and lightened in most fearful wise, that it put me into an agony. So I looked up in my dream, and saw the clouds rack, at an unusual rate; upon which I heard a great sound of a trumpet, and also saw a man sitting upon a cloud, attended with the thousands of heaven; they were all in flaming fire; also the heavens were in a burning flame. I heard then a great voice, saying, 'Arise, ye dead, and come to judgment,' and with that the rocks rent, the graves opened, and the dead that were therein came forth; some of them were exceeding glad, and looking upward; and some sought to hide themselves under the mountains. Then I saw the man that sat upon the cloud, open the book and bid the world draw near. Yet there was, by reason of a fierce flame which issued out and came before him, a convenient distance betwixt him and them, as betwixt the judge and prisoners at the bar. I heard it also proclaimed to them that attended on the man that sat on the cloud, 'Gather together the tares, the chaff and stubble, and cast them into the burning lake.' And with that the bottomless pit opened, just whereabouts I stood; out of the mouth of which there

came, in an abundant manner, smoke and coals of fire, with hideous noises. It was also said to the same persons, 'Gather my wheat into the garner,' and with that I saw many catched up and carried away into the clouds; but I was left behind. I also sought to hide myself, but I could not; for the man that sat upon the cloud still kept his eye upon me; my sins also came into my mind; and my conscience did accuse me on every side. Upon this I awakened from my sleep."

In his "Systematic Theology," Dr. Strong thus cites the case of John Nelson: "A man who afterwards became a Methodist preacher was converted in Whitfield's time by a vision of the judgment, in which he saw all men gathered before the throne and each one coming up to the Book of God's Law, tearing open his heart before it 'as one would tear open the bosom of his shirt,' comparing his heart with the things written in the book, and according as they agreed or disagreed with that standard, either passing triumphant to the company of the blest, or going with howling to the company of the damned. No word was spoken; the judge sat silent; the judgment was one of self-revelation and self-condemnation."

Sinners, convicted under faithful preaching, anticipate the final judgment and tremble. When Paul, before the wicked Felix and Drusilla, "reasoned of righteousness, continence and the judgment to come, Felix was terrified and broke in

with, Go thy way for this time; and when I have a convenient season, I will call thee unto me."

Some who commit the unpardonable sin anticipate this judgment with most horrible forebodings. Having sinned wilfully and maliciously against all the grace manifested in the triune God—insulting the Father by treading under foot his only begotten Son—insulting the Son by counting his blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy thing—insulting the Holy Spirit by doing despite to his gracious wooing—"there remaineth for them no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain, fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries." (Heb. 10:26-29.) These wretched souls never doubt the certainty, nearness and eternity of the final judgment.

(2) *Many times after death.*

Not only before death do men often in apprehension stand before this judgment bar, but even more fearfully after death in their disembodied state. They feel it coming not only as an explanation of present torment, but as a prelude to greater woes.

The fallen King of Babylon found hell's greeting to be a foreboding of the judgment to which he was reserved: "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee. . . . And they shall say unto thee, Art thou become like unto us? . . . How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the

morning! . . . Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, THIS!" (Isa. 14.)

Heaven's refusal to grant the rich man's appeal for mercy announces the end of probation and heralds the coming judgment: "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things . . . but now thou art in anguish. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us." (Luke 16.)

Hell's imprisonment and chains make lost souls sensible that they are being held over for trial at the great assize: Unlike the spirits of the made perfect (Heb. 12:23), who, as purified souls, under the altar confidently invoke the coming judgment for redress of grievances (Rev. 6:9-11); these, as "spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3:19), are with evil angels "reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. 2:14), and illustrate the truth that "the Lord knoweth how to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment." (2 Pet. 2:9.)

Moreover, all the attending circumstances of our Lord's second advent dreadfully tend to fix their minds on the judgment now at hand.

The voice of the archangel and the sound of the trumpet smite them with terror. The discriminating ministry of the angels in taking one and leaving another is fearfully suggestive. The difference between their resurrection bodies and those of the

righteous is sadly prophetic of other things. The separation before the throne of the wicked from the just is recognized as only a prelude of final destiny. But most terribly suggestive of all is the piercing look of the glorious One on the white throne. They recognize him as the crucified One, whom they despised and mocked on earth, but now crowned King of kings and Lord of lords. They shiver under the smiting of his silent glance and cry out, in agony, "Oh, rocks and mountains fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the lamb." (Rev. 6: 16.)

Next to the eye of the Judge, the most dreadful anticipation of what awaits them is suggested by witnessing the beginnings of judgment in the house of God. They see all false professors, all deluded ones, all hypocrites eliminated from the body of the saints. And every time one of these is cast out, they do exceedingly quake and tremble for fear of the judgment about to fall on themselves. They witness the vain knocking of the foolish virgins who took no oil for their lamps, and hear their fruitless cry, "Open to us," and the stern voice of the bridegroom: "Too late! too late! Ye cannot enter now."

They see the rejection of prophets and miracle-workers like Balaam and Judas and hear the awful colloquy: "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and

by thy name do many mighty works?"—"I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

They behold the Lord's reckoning with the unfaithful servant who said in his heart, "My lord delayeth his coming," and began to beat his fellow-servants and to eat and drink with the drunken. They see him cut asunder and receiving his portion with hypocrites. Where is weeping and gnashing of teeth. (Matt. 24:48-50.)

They witness the summary disposal of the man who buried his Lord's talent and behold him cast into outer darkness as an unprofitable servant.

They witness the bridegroom's inspection of his guests and hear his inquiry of one hapless man, "Friend, what doest thou here without the wedding garment? Bind him hand and foot and cast him into outer darkness, where is wailing and gnashing of teeth." They see the bound man's speechless lips and helpless hands and feet. No voice now to plead for mercy, or to make excuse. No hands now to uplift in prayer or to work belated righteousness. No foot now to run to mercy's seat, or to flee from the wrath to come. Poor dumb lips; poor bound hands and feet!

Finally they witness the terrible ordeal of fire in which even the Christian's unscriptural work perishes, himself barely escaping as it were by fire. Now, indeed, do outbreaking sinners realize the awful import of the text: "If the righteous is scarcely saved, where, oh where, shall the ungodly

and the sinners appear!" Thus both before and after death does the sinner stand in anticipation before the judgment seat of Christ.

PROP. 3.—*The sinner at the judgment.*

This judgment fulfills all anticipations. It is every way terrible.

Its publicity is awful. All the intelligences of the universe are there—heaven's shining angels—hell's lowering demons—earth's men, whether good or bad.

Its scope is awful. Every idle word, brutal oath or foul blasphemy. Every slimy thought, unclean imagination or undeveloped intent of envy or malice. Every deed of darkness.

The books are awful. What God has written is written. Written not alone in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, as was Pilate's inscription on the cross, but in the Volapuk of men and angels. Fearful books. There is the winged book of God's curses that swoops like a bird of prey on every thief and liar and adulterer and fixes beak and talon on his heart and lifts its shadows from his future NEVERMORE.

There is the book of tears. Every tear, O sinner, thy wickedness has caused to fall from a mother's weeping eyes, every tear distilled from the sorrows of those whom thou hast wronged, and oh, infinitely more than all others, every tear shed by the Redeemer when his heart was broken by thy impenitence and incorrigible rebellion, all these will

be as scalding drops of liquid fire on thy soul forever.

At this judgment, O sinner, three great laws have exceeding emphasis:

1. THE LAW OF MEMORY—God's memory and thine.

In time, thy memory is often treacherous. Thou hast put many things behind thee, and because thou didst not like to retain them in mind, thou hast held them as dead and quite forgotten. But God himself never forgets, and has the power to quicken thy memory. From the book of his recollection, all thy sins are set in order before thee and thy memory awakened to recognize them. As a palimpsest manuscript under the microscope reveals the earlier writing under the later writing, so shall thy memory be made to recall, reproduce and revivify all facts supposed long since to be sponged from the tablets of the mind. When God maketh inquisition for blood he remembereth, and thy memory is quickened to verify all that his memory witnesseth. There can be no dispute as to the facts. As the opposing attorneys for plaintiff and defendant submit to an appellate court a joint statement of facts, so shall thy memory and God's memory subscribe to an agreed statement of facts.

2. THE LAW OF CONSCIENCE.

But it is not enough to remember the facts. There must be recognition and confession of their moral quality. These deeds and thoughts and

imaginations and words of thine were not idle things. They appear righteous or unrighteous, when quadrated with supreme law. Not the law of human custom or jurisprudence, but the infinitely holy law of God, prescribing all good and proscribing all evil.

Thy conscience in time, O sinner, becomes blunted in its moral perceptions. Thy sins debauch and corrupt it. But that day it will see clearly. There are no mists in the atmosphere of the last judgment and no illusions possible. That day thy spirit will be as the candle of the Lord. It will pronounce evil all that is evil. It will not put light for darkness and darkness for light. What God condemns thy conscience will condemn. As thy quickened memory will prevent any dispute as to the facts, so thy quickened conscience will prevent any dispute as to the moral quality of actions.

3. THE LAW OF CHARACTER.

Thy habits of thought and conduct have produced fixity of character. If it be now true that what a man thinks that he is, more certainly it becomes true that what the trend of his thought and life has produced that will he remain forever. There is constant tendency to fixedness of type. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are ACCUSTOMED TO DO EVIL." This long-continued habit becomes second nature. Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people. If, O sinner,

thou art not now made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, thou couldest find no happiness in that light. If already thou preferrest to be buried under hills and mountains rather than look once on the radiance and holy face of the enthroned Messiah, how couldest thou endure to see his face forever? With thy nature evil to the core, how couldest thou enjoy the blessedness of those whom grace hath redeemed? On the portals of the heavenly city is written, Let no unclean thing enter here. The inscription on the seal which stamps the divine impress on Christians reads, Let him that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity. And the six-winged Seraphim that stands in the presence of the immaculate One, with twain cover their face—with twain their feet—with twain they fly—while they cry continually, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty!

That place would be hell to thee.

That music would harrow thy soul.

That light would be so inexpressibly painful to thee that any depth of hell would be preferable.

And when the supreme question is put to thy soul, O Soul, how didst thou treat God's love in the gift of his Son's grace? How didst thou treat the invitations of the gospel? How didst thou treat the messengers who tendered the divine love? How didst thou treat God's love in the gift of his Son? How didst thou esteem the cleansing blood of the covenant? How didst thou treat the wooings

of the Holy Spirit? Thy memory will recall the facts, thy conscience will declare their moral quality and thy lips will confess the equity of thy eternal sentence, Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

One Book will tell all the story—the Book of Life. The mere absence of thy name from that roll will be sufficient. How suggestive, yea, how fearful the song:

"When thou, my righteous Judge, shalt come
To take thy ransomed people home;
Oh, can I bear the piercing thought,
What if my name should be left out!"

PROP. 4.—*There will be degrees in the sufferings of the lost.*

Our Lord himself declared both the fact and the principle: "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt go down unto Hades; for if the mighty works had been done in Sodom which were done in thee, it would have remained until this day. But I say

unto you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." (Matt. 11:20-24.)

According to the light, privileges and opportunities neglected or despised will be the grade of suffering. Some are greater sinners than others. Their guilt is more aggravated. They have played the part of demons. They have debauched and seduced others. They have shed innocent blood. They have fattened on the woes of others. Self-centered, they have selfishly lived and died.

And some have been openly and daringly impious. They have blasphemed God and trampled scornfully under foot the blood of Jesus. They have mocked and blasphemed the Holy Spirit. But whatever the doom, its righteousness is confessed on bended knee. So at last the Scripture is fulfilled: "Jesus being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. 2:8-11.)

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2

Y0-BNY-032